

Tip, D. to Cash 100.

Feb 20 1918

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

THE
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

*✓ 1-2
48
1918*

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. XLVIII—NO. 1.

JANUARY, 1918.

P 20

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.

GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT

1918

CONTENTS

I. The Origin and Purpose of the Protestant Reformation. . .	1
By David Schley Schaff, D.D.	
II. The Legacy of the Reformation.	19
By Rev. J. A. Hall, D.D.	
III. Luther in Our Day.	39
By Rev. Edwin Heyl Delk, D.D.	
IV. Liberty	40
By Rev. John Erler, A.M., Ph.D.	
V. The Liturgical Development of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. (Concluded).	65
By Rev. R. Morris Smith, Ph.D., D.D.	
VI. The Common Service Book and Hymnal	91
By Elsie Singmaster Lewars.	
VII. The Union Movements in the History of Lutheranism. . .	100
By Professor J. L. Neve, D.D.	
VIII. Current Theological Thought.	117
By Professor J. A. Singmaster, D.D.	
IX. Review of Recent Literature.	129
<p>The Christ We Forget; A Life of Our Lord for Men of To-Day —Biblical Dogmatics—Franklin Spencer Spalding; Man and Bishop—The Church and the Man—African Missionary Heroes and Heroines—Immortality, an Essay in Discovery—A Theology for the Social Gospel—Lectures on the Church and the Sacra- ments—Recovered Yesterdays in Literature—The Life of Jesus— The Peaceful Life—The Old Faith in the New Day—The Church After the War—Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics—Sermons on Apostles' Creed—Understanding the Scriptures—Every Church Its Own Evangelist—A Prophet of the Spirit—Jephtha's Daughter— Life and Letters of the Rev. John Philip Boehm—The Reforma- tion in Principle and Action—American Poets and Their Theology —Army and Navy Service Book—The Lutheran Church Year Book for 1918—Ephod and Ark—The Luther Coat of Arms—Slumber- land and Slumber Songs—A System of Natural Theism—Luther's Hymns—Little Playmates.</p>	

THE
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. XLVIII.

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1918

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
852112
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATION
R 1919

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

BOOKS REVIEWED

JANUARY.

The Christ We Forget; A Life of Our Lord for Men of To-Day—Biblical Dogmatics—Franklin Spencer Spalding; Man and Bishop—The Church and the Man—African Missionary Heroes and Heroines—Immortality, an Essay in Discovery—A Theology for the Social Gospel—Lectures on the Church and the Sacraments—Recovered Yesterdays in Literature—The Life of Jesus—The Peaceful Life—The Old Faith in the New Day—The Church After the War—Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics—Sermons on Apostles' Creed—Understanding the Scriptures—Every Church Its Own Evangelist—A Prophet of the Spirit—Jephtha's Daughter—Life and Letters of the Rev. John Philip Boehm—The Reformation in Principle and Action—American Poets and Their Theology—Army and Navy Service Book—The Lutheran Church Year Book for 1918—Ephod and Ark—The Luther Coat of Arms—Slumberland and Slumber Songs—A System of Natural Theism—Luther's Hymns—Little Playmates.

APRIL.

The Holy Trinity—Introduction to the New Testament—The Record of a Quaker Conscience—Jesus on His Second Coming—The Master Quest—The Call to Arms—Confessions of a Brown-ing Lover—The Consciousness of Jesus—The Book of Revelations Not a Mystery—Letters on the Atonement—Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte—Christliche Dogmatik—Outline Studies in Christian Doctrine—Life of Dr. Martin Luther—My Church—The Cross and the Crescent—Stories for Children—The Schoolmaster and His Son—The Three Kings—Luther's Picture—Tyndalle's New Testament—Documentary Sketch of the Reformation.

JULY.

Wartburg Lesson Helps for Beginners in the Sunday School and Home—He Whom Thou Lovest is Sick—Funeral Sermons by Lutheran Divines—Outlines of Biblical Hermeneutics—Can We Believe in Immortality—The Psychology of Preaching—This Life and the Next—The Teachings of Jesus—Giant Hours with Poet Preachers—The Significance of the Protestant Reformation—The Sources of the Hexateuch—The Religion of Israel—Alpheus W. Wilson; A Prince of Israel—Aram and Israel—The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expression—The Good Shepherd—Side-Stepping Saints—The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings—The Man of Power—Bring Him to Me—The Weekly Rally Service—The Christian College—The Mythology of All Races.

OCTOBER.

The Roots of the War—The Lutherans of New York—The Mythology of All Races—America—Here and Over There—The Rural Church Serving the Community.



THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY 1918.

ARTICLE I.

THE ORIGIN AND PURPOSE OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION.¹

BY DAVID SCHLEY SCHAFF, D.D.

The Protestant Reformation is the most memorable event since the days of the apostles. It marked the close of the Middle Ages and ushered in these modern centuries. It was a protest against the ecclesiastical system built up by the practice of able pontiffs and justified by the acute reasoning of the Schoolmen. It was more than a protest : It was a reproclamation of the gospel. It announced emancipation from the papal monarchy. It brought release from bondage to the priesthood, which claimed as a monopoly the function of mediating between the soul and God. It gave the Scriptures to the common man. It republished salvation by free grace. It asserted for all alike the right to go at once for pardon and life to the chief Bishop and Shepherd of our souls. It proclaimed the sovereignty of the individual man. Setting aside the monastic ideal, it taught once more the true use of the world and the dignity of all legitimate human occupa-

¹ An address delivered at Dallas, Texas, before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, May 19, 1917, reprinted with additions by the author and by his permission.

tions; it taught that every creature of God is good, and nothing to be despised, if it be received with thanksgiving.

The impulse which gave the Reformation birth was wholly religious. Social and economic unrest prevailed in the sixteenth century as in the twentieth. Social and economic changes were engaging the dreams and speculation of the age—not all Utopian. Social and economic betterments followed the preaching of the Reformers. But, in the first instance, and all through, the Reformers had it as their controlling aim to reannounce the plain way whereby a man may be just with God.

Starting in Wittenberg, the movement spread to Switzerland, where it had Zwingli and Calvin for its chief leaders. It extended to Holland and crossed the channel to England and Scotland. In Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, the new system completely replaced the old. In Hungary it divided the population. In France it promised well, but met with disfavor from the king, and by the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day and bloody wars was almost blotted out. In Spain and Italy the Inquisition soon crushed the seeds of the rising faith. The extensive spread of the uprising shows how widely religious dissatisfaction prevailed. But for the divisions among Protestants, which we lament, the principles of the Reformation would have been planted in a wider area than the land which proved to be a permanent soil for them. Save for these divisions, there probably would have been no Thirty Years' War, no century-long struggle in England, no harrowing of the Covenanters.

Like the apostles of the first century and the Schoolmen of the Middle Ages, the Reformers form a group by themselves. Belonging to different nations and speaking different languages, they were united in a common purpose and remarkably agreed in their teachings. They had no thought of constituting a new Church. Their purpose was to clear the Medieval Church of corruptions and once more conform it fully to its charter, the New Testament. To the question once put to a Protestant,

"Where was your Church before Luther?" the reply was made, and aptly, "Where was your face before it was washed?" The aim of the Reformers was to cleanse. No new truth did they invent any more than Columbus and the Cabots created a new world. The Italian navigators found the old lands lying under the western sun and made them known. What the Reformers did was to open the old Book and make known what they found written therein. This, at least, they professed to do.

But, though their aim was one, the Reformers were distinguished by personal traits and also by the specific contributions which they made to the main movement.

To Martin Luther it was given to be the leader of the Reformation and to state its leading Biblical principles. His life was full of dramatic scenes as perhaps the life of no mortal man in history: his sudden withdrawal from the world in favor of the "religious life"; his visit to Rome; the posting of the Ninety-five Theses; the appearance before Cajetan; the colloquy at Leipzig; the burning of the papal bull at Wittenberg; the trial before the emperor at Worms; the confinement in the Wartburg; the meeting with Zwingli at Marburg in 1529. He gave to his people—to follow the Catholic historian, Döllinger—what no other single man gave to a people: the Bible, the catechism, and the hymn book; and in these respects he set an example to the other Reformers. He was the strongest of the strong. He felt the full onset of the papal opposition. Yet nowhere was he more himself than in the home, translating "Æsop's Fables" for his children and praying at the deathbed of his little daughter, Lena, weeping as if his frame would be shaken to pieces. After the Diet of Worms he could write, "If I had a hundred heads, they should be all cut off before I would yield up my conscience." On the other hand, his letters to his wife are full of tenderness, and parents were never shown more filial devotion by a distinguished son than Martin Luther gave to his old father and mother. It is one of the noblest of his traits that he was never spoiled by honors, never forgot his lowly origin. "I am a real peas-

ant," he used to say. "My father and grandfather and all my forefathers were peasants."

Ulrich Zwingli, brought up in the humanistic culture, was as firm as Luther. It was characteristic of him, as later of Calvin, that he used the State to help the new views to prevalence. As a patriot, he died on the field of battle. The strictest of the Reformers in his view of divine predestination, he was yet the mildest of them all in the application of divine mercy, extending salvation to all children dying in infancy, heathen or Christian, baptized or unbaptized.

John Calvin, exile from the land of his birth, made Geneva the bulwark of Protestant liberties and the outpost of free education. With a strong hand, sometimes gloved with steel, he established a Christian commonwealth. He died in surroundings solemn and august. He did what Luther did not do. He won the peoples of far western Europe permanently for the Reformation, and, either through his own teachings or through his disciples, has proceeded the representative form of Church government. Upon him Renan pronounced the judgment that "he was the most Christian man of his age." Much as the Western World owes to Calvin as an advocate of the representative principle in the government of Church and State, it must never be overlooked that he added no new doctrinal statement to the body of Protestant truth. All the spiritual doctrines Protestantism had been settled before Calvin joined the Protestant movement. When the Ninety-five Theses were posted on the church door in Wittenberg, Calvin was only eight years old; when the papal bull was burnt he was eleven; when Luther was standing before the emperor at Worms, Calvin was still a boy of twelve; and when the great Genevan Reformer experienced "conversion" and adopted the new system in 1533, the Augsburg Confession was already three years old.

In England the new views won against the old, lost, and won again, until, under Elizabeth and by the defeat of the Armada, England was established as a Protestant

nation, but not without "times both sharp and bloody," as Heylin put it. Its martyrs form a bright cloud of witnesses. One of these witnesses, William Tyndale, was strangled and burnt at Vilvorde for having dared to translate the New Testament into English, a translation which was set up in type in Worms whither Tyndale was forced to flee, for, as he said, there was no place in all England for him to translate the New Testament. One of the chief hierlooms handed down from that age, is the saying of Bishop Latimer: "Play the man, Master Ridley, we shall this day light such a candle in England as by God's grace shall never be put out."

In the northern kingdom, the land of the kirk and the covenants, Knox, in the spirit of John the Baptist, denounced the introduction of a single Mass into the realm as more fearful than the landing of ten thousand armed men. Over his grave the regent might fitly say, "Here lies he who never feared the face of man."

To all these men Protestant peoples owe a debt. They opened a new religious era; they gave the Bible to the people; they taught justification by faith alone; they laid the foundation of popular institutions; and it is fair to say that if you want to read the chapter of growing religious liberty, the chapter of popular intelligence, the chapter of civil liberties based on the dignity of the individual man, if you want to read the chapter of enterprise in commerce and invention, you must go to the lands which stopped to listen to the voices of Luther and Calvin, Zwingli and Beza, Latimer and Knox, to Germany and Switzerland, Holland, England and Scotland and to these western shores where the descendants of the Reformers planted our early institutions.

When the Reformation came, it was like a bolt out of a clear sky. This does not mean that there was not religious unrest in Europe. It does not ignore the premonitions and presentiments of doctrinal reform voiced by Marsilius of Padua, Wyclif, Huss, and Savonarola, and John of Wesel and John Wessel along the lower Rhine. John Wyclif anticipated the movement of the sixteenth

century by setting aside the doctrine of transubstantiation and almost all the medieval dogmas which the Protestant Reformers renounced. John Huss was burned to death. Both of these men pronounced certain popes antichrists and defined the Church as the body of the elect. Wyclif gave the Scriptures in the vernacular of his people. Huss accomplished more, perhaps, by his death than was ever accomplished by the death of any other mere human being. In noble words he expressed the watchword of religious sincerity and progress when he said, "Not custom are we to follow, but the law of Christ and the truth." A splendid testimony was given by Savonarola when, dying on the square of Florence, he replied to the words of the bishop of Vasona, "I separate thee from the Church militant and the Church triumphant," with the words, "Nay, not from the Church triumphant." Wessel anticipated the coming movement when he declared: "The Church can not err, but what is the Church? It is the communion of saints, to which all true believers belong, who are bound by one faith, one hope, one love to Christ."

A noble body of men were these reformers before the Reformation, but no general uprising followed their teachings. The Church went on after they were dead as it had gone on before, if we except the movement in the kingdom of Bohemia. When Luther began his work he was independent of them all. To him they were all heretics. He had not read their writings. From them he did not get his message. Huss' treatise on The Church and Wessel's writings he did not see till he was well on his way as a Reformer and there seems to be no evidence that he ever saw a page of Wyclif's writings. His career was not the last act fulfilling a drama. It opened a drama.

When the Reformation came it came from a most unexpected quarter. It did not arise among the peoples of the South, moved by those impulses which gave to culture and art a new birth, and to the study of philosophy and statecraft a fresh impetus. It did not arise with the pre-

lates of the Church, the presumed guardians of apostolic teaching and the infallible superintendents of Christian progress. It did not originate in the central seat of western Christendom, hallowed by the blood of early Christian martyrs, the goal of generations of pious pilgrims, the throne of the vicar of Christ. It originated among that people of the North which in Rome and Italy was called a race of barbarians and beasts. It originated in an obscure town—as it were in another Nazareth—and, as if further to confound the calculations of men, it was proclaimed by a simple monk of lowly origin.

Nor was there any collusion between Luther and any group of men of his time to overthrow the inherited ecclesiastical institutions. There was no body of disgruntled monks with whom he entered into conspiracy to get liberty from the conventual order to break up the old system. As soon as that remarkable critic and scholar, Erasmus, came to recognize that a religious change was threatened, which would involve the punitive opposition of the Church authorities, he discretely passed by on the other side. "I abominate tumult more than anything else," he wrote. "I am not so insane as to do anything against the chief vicar of Christ and I am unwilling to cross even a bishop." Addressing Leo himself, he spoke of that pontiff "as the chief imitator of Christ, who spends himself for Christian salvation." These words were written at the time when the Diet of Worms was impending, and in several other letters Erasmus went on to say that if they wanted Luther to roast or to boil, it mattered not to him.

In passing a judgment upon the Reformation, it is of prime importance to bear these facts in mind. Luther entered upon his career as a Reformer, not with any hostility to the Church, not through a message from the reformers before the Reformation, and not in collusion with any body of men, his contemporaries. If ever mortal man since the days of Paul started off on his mission independently of human aid, it was Martin Luther.

When Luther entered upon his career in 1517, he was

impelled by an inward conviction won through the study of the Bible. Poring over its open pages, he received his message. The Reformation was an experience in Luther's own soul before it became a historic movement which spread over Europe. He proclaimed a new era, because the new era, had first dawned in him. Not of man, not by man, did this conviction arise. It developed gradually as by a process and yet he became conscious of it suddenly as if by revelation. Through recent and most unexpected literary discoveries this statement of the origin of the Reformation has had abundant confirmation.

In entering the convent at Erfurt, Luther sought to make his calling and election sure, to escape or appease the punitive justice of God. The monastery was the surest way, known to the Middle Ages, to reach holiness here and heaven hereafter. Anselm, in his letters, declared that no other way was so sure. St. Bernard was not satisfied until he had persuaded all his brothers to enter the convent and his sister to take the veil. The monkish vow came to be treated as equivalent to a second baptism by which the monk was restored to innocency. This was the teaching of St. Bernard and Thomas Aquinas. The meritorious holiness to which the monkish vow was the introduction, no one following a lay calling could ever hope to secure.

With singular intensity Luther devoted himself to monastic rule and wasted his body with asceticisms. "If monk," so he said in after years, "ever got to heaven by monkery, surely I should have got there." His life-long foe, Cochlaeus, after seeing him at Worms in 1521, wrote that Luther was "so wasted with cares and studies that you could have counted the bones behind his skin."

He had the privilege of seeing religion in practice at its central hearth, Rome. In that city he ran from altar to altar and crypt to crypt, saying Masses and wishing his parents were in purgatory, that he might pray them out. He climbed the *Scala Santa*, at every step making petition that his grandfather might be released from that uncomfortable abode.

His opportunities for cultivating piety were the best the age knew. Strong in religious purpose, he yet failed through these experiences to find religious peace. But his punctuality in religious exercises, together with his abilities, made him a marked man. He was held up by his superiors as a model monk. The head of the Augustinians, John of Staupitz, gave him his warm friendship, and when he went to Rome it was as a delegate of this order. On his return, Luther was chosen its district vicar, and on the recommendation of Staupitz, he was called to a professorship in the University of Wittenberg. A year later, he received the theologian's highest academic honor, the doctorate of divinity, an honor of which he was proud. But at the time of receiving the doctorate, so he tells us, he did not know what justification by faith means. Then followed the period of five years leading up to the hour of high noon when he posted the Theses on the church door in Wittenberg, October 31, 1517. What was he reading in those years? What thoughts were making pathways through this monk's mind? What messages was he delivering to his students? Was he undergoing any special preparation for his public career? By the literary discoveries, to which allusion has been made, these questions have all been answered.

We now possess some of the very books which Luther read and diligently annotated during these five years. From Melanchthon we knew that he was lecturing on The Psalms and The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, but nothing more. Now we have the very texts of those lectures, in copies taken down by students in the lecture room, and, in the case of the lectures on Romans, we have in addition the very manuscript which Luther wrote with his own hand. The lectures on the Psalms were delivered 1513-1514, the lectures on Romans 1515-1516.

It is noteworthy, on first sight, that the new professor took up the very books of the Bible which set forth in every verse the immediate communion of the soul with God and elaborate the doctrine that the sinner is saved by faith alone. The Schoolmen, one after another, had

reveled in the imagery of the Song of Songs; Luther interpreted the cold statements of Paul in his fullest epistle.

But most noteworthy is the progress which these lectures show as going on in Luther's mind as he sank himself in the teachings of God's Word. In the lectures on the Psalms this progress is scarcely apparent except in the increasing disregard, as Luther goes on, of the exegetical method inherited from the Middle Ages. This is all changed in the lecture on Romans. Here as he proceeds we find him denouncing Aristotle, the authority of the Middle Ages, "as the accursed heathen philosopher," and dissenting from Thomas Aquinas, the prince of the Schoolmen. The Schoolmen themselves he pronounces "swine theologians," a designation somewhat offensive but expressing forcibly what Luther meant, that they had fed upon the husks of the human reason instead of upon the pure wheat of Scripture. He even dares to dissent from the African father from whom the Augustinian order had derived its name. More and more he holds forth Augustine as the reliable teacher on the doctrines of human inability and unmerited grace. More and more his independence as a student and expositor comes into view. He pronounces treatises ascribed to Augustine spurious, a judgment confirmed by modern criticism. He compares Scripture with Scripture, making it its own interpreter—a principle the Reformers afterwards with unanimity insisted upon. He goes back to the original Greek text, saying again and again, "The Greek is thus and so." Finally, in the comments on the later chapters of Paul's epistle, the reader is fairly swept along by the spirit with which they are pervaded, the spirit of triumphant joy and assurance of salvation. Here Luther seems to be lifted above himself with the conviction of justifying grace. "Man," he says, "is at all times a sinner, at all times penitent, at all times righteous"—*semper peccator, semper penitens, semper justus*. If it be true that Jonathan Edwards, as he tells us, studied Locke's philosophy with the greed with which a miser counts coins of gold, so this monk in the silence of his

study, was searching with intense craving for the meaning of Paul's chapters setting forth God's grace.

Gradually, by severe study of the Scriptures, Luther came to his conviction that justification is by free grace through faith alone.

It is not at all inconsistent with this experience that the apprehension of this truth came to him as by a flash. Suddenly, so Luther said in later years, in the convent in Wittenberg, the meaning of the passage, "The just shall live by faith," burst upon him, opening to his soul, as it were, the very gates of paradise. This happened sometime between the years 1512 and 1517. Sir William Hamilton had a like experience. For months he had been working upon a higher problem, when suddenly, while walking on the street, the solution flashed upon his mind. So it was with Anselm in the case of the ontological argument. That celebrated argument for the existence of God was the result of a long process going on in Anselm's mind and yet its solution came as a revelation, when in the darkness of the night its outline suddenly stood before the great Schoolman's intellect in clear statement.

When Luther posted up his Theses, he had already made the transition from a Church-taught man to a Bible-taught man. To him, as the lectures on Romans state again and again, the Scriptures had come to be of compelling authority. Not upon Church teachers did he depend for their meaning but upon the plain text as he found it in the original. Before he posted up the Theses, this doctrine, and the doctrine that we are justified by faith apart from works of the law, had taken full possession of his thought. The opening words of those Theses were a firm statement of the former conviction. "Our Lord and Master, when he said, 'do penance' (the translation of Jerome's Vulgate), meant that the entire life should be a repenting." They had the ring of a new era. They were the assertion of the supreme immediate authority of Christ to which all other authorities were to be subordinated. On this point Luther and the other Reformers never wavered. It was the victory that overcame.

The experience of Calvin was likewise the result of a process of study and struggle and yet also, as it were, a sudden revelation. He has left on record two brief accounts. "By a sudden conversion," so he said, he was transferred from the mire and his feet set upon the rock. "After trying," he said, "by all the ways of the Catholic faith to reach peace, I failed, and finally the Gospel, like a sudden ray of light, showed me the deep abyss of error I was in, and, frightened and with tears, I took God's way."

The inner experiences of these two leading Reformers stand, as it were, like bastions of rock at the entrance of the reform movement of the sixteenth century. All sorts of psychological explanations of Luther's course may be attempted, but these things stand sure of these two men: They left the old system with reluctance; they knew its workings by training and experience; they were diligent students of the Scriptures; they were in no conspiracy to establish a new system; a compelling conviction from within moved them to enter on their new course.

The same is true of other Reformers. In his first sermon on The Lord's Prayer, Bishop Hugh Latimer declared: "I was as obstinate a papist as any was in England, insomuch that, when I should be made a bachelor of divinity, my whole oration went against Philip Melancthon and against his opinions. Then having met Master Bilney, or rather Saint Bilney, that suffered death for Christ's sake, I learned more by his confession than before in many years, so that from that time forward I began to smell the Word of God and forsook the school doctors and such fooleries." The bishop then went on to give an account of the practical ministeries he set out to perform in Bilney's company.

Again, if we would pass a fair judgment upon the Reformation, we must bear in mind another consideration of prime importance: Its leaders, the Reformers, were men furnished with the highest education of their time. I have no intention of enlarging upon their writings which constitute a large contribution to religious litera-

ture. I am now interested in calling attention to a single feature.

The Reformers studied the latest books and were familiar with the most recent investigations of their age. The study of Greek and Hebrew, a new thing, was looked upon with suspicion by many of their contemporaries or denounced as reprobate. The Reformers, on the contrary, gave themselves to it diligently and were, in respect to theological studies, in the van of their age. "The old ways are good enough," said many. "We cannot improve upon the Fathers and the Schoolmen. What they did not know is not worth knowing. The Vulgate is sufficient. It has served for a thousand years and more." "Man," said the old English priest, when Tyndale told him he was intending to make God's laws accessible to the boy that drove the plow (that is, translate the Scriptures into English), "we were better without God's laws than the pope's."

If the Reformers in Wittenberg, Zurich, Basel, Strasbourg, Geneva, and Cambridge, had not been up-to-date men, there would have been no Reformation. Gregory the Great knew no Greek. Anselm knew no Greek. Thomas Aquinas knew no Greek. Bernard knew no Greek. Wyclif knew no Greek. John Huss knew no Greek. During the seven or eight centuries before 1500—if we except the hazy traditions of Irish convents—not a single western Churchman knew Greek. But Luther did, and Calvin did, and Zwingli and Œcolampadius and Bucer did, and Bullinger and Beza did.

In Luther's lectures on Romans we can point almost to the precise moment when he had a copy of Erasmus' Greek New Testament in his hands. No sooner did that epochal volume appear, March, 1516, than Luther was using it at the ninth chapter of Romans. Later in his replies to his assailants who fortified their statements with conciliar decisions and papal decretals—precedents of the canon law—Luther bulwarked his pages with texts from the Scriptures and referred back to the Greek, notably to the word *metanoeo*, which, he told his assailants, did not

mean to do works of penance, as the Vulgate translated it, but to "change one's mind."

To accurate linguistic attainments Calvin also added a mind of rare acumen and logical precision. This was abundantly recognized in the schools where he studied law under eminent jurists. He was a humanist before he was a Reformer and issued a commentary on Seneca's treatise on mercy. Luther translated the Scriptures from the originals for the first time in ten centuries. Calvin was the chief critical expositor among the Reformers, basing his studies on the original text for the first time in ten centuries or more. Even Augustine did not do this and had to content himself with the Itala and the Vulgate.

As for Zwingli, no sooner did he see one of Erasmus' New Testaments than he copied the Greek of the Pauline epistles for his own use. He had studied in Vienna and Basel and his humanistic attainments won from the pope an annual pension.

Beza was an expert Greek scholar, as his edition of the Greek Testament shows. Among the English Reformers were Cambridge and Oxford men, who had sat at the feet of Grocyn, Colet, and Erasmus. When these and other Reformers spoke and wrote it was as men endowed with high intellectual gifts, conversant with the medieval system and unequalled in their knowledge of the Scriptures in the original.

If ever a body of men was competent to speak against a prevailing system, then the Reformers by reason of mental gifts, by reason of scholastic training, by reason of experience in convent and university, by reason of familiarity with the customs of the people and priesthood, were competent to speak against the prevailing religious system inherited from the Middle Ages. Who of his age was so quick as Luther to accept the proof given by Laurentius Valla that the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals were an invention? Who was more deeply read in the Fathers than Calvin? Who introduced the modern school method into Germany, if not Melanchthon? Who insisted on general education for poor as well as rich, if not Luther, Cal-

vin, Zwingli, and John Knox? These men were acquainted with the past and familiar with the conditions of their age before they advocated the policies which these modern times have put into practice.

The medieval scheme, against which the Reformers with one consent contended, presented three main constructions: The monarchical papacy, the sacramental and sacerdotal system, and the Inquisition, all so deeply grounded by the dialectics of the schoolmen that they seemed to be as firmly established as the foundations of the medieval cathedrals.

The papacy was accepted as the final arbiter in all things human. The notorious bull of Boniface VIII, the *Unam Sanctum*, issued 1302, asserted three things with a clearness which leaves nothing to be desired. As against the claims of the Greek Church, it asserted the unity of the Church under the Roman pontiff. As against the independence of the State, it asserted that both swords, the spiritual sword and the sword of steel, are subject to the will of the Roman pontiff. As against the idea that Christ can give eternal life independently of all seen institutions, it asserted that it is "altogether necessary for the salvation of every human being that he be subject to the Roman pontiff." A crass assertion, this last, as opposed to our Lord's words, "He that believeth on Me hath eternal life"! These assertions of Boniface stirred up many a pamphleteer from Dante and Marsilius of Padua to Wyclif and Huss and Gerson and Nieheim; but, in spite of opposition, they remained the unmodified view of the hierarchy. The Council of Constance, 1415, declared that the final arbiter in ecclesiastical matters should be a general council. This decision solemnly made, with such men as Gerson, d'Ailly, and Cardina Zarabella, leaders in the council, was easily superseded fifty years later by Pius II in his famous *bullæ execrabilis*. Just six months before Luther posted up his Theses, the bull of 1302 was solemnly reaffirmed by Leo X. According to Prierias, Leo X's spokesman against Luther, the pope is above all councils: he judges all and is judged by no man. From his

tribunal there is no appeal: his word releases from purgatory; the Scriptures themselves get their authority from his approval. This notable treatise was written in 1520.

The sacramental system, to further which the Schoolmen bent their best energies, placed the priest at the gate of heaven. Except by his sufferance, no man can have entrance. The sacraments which he dispenses act like drugs. They contain and confer grace by virtue inherent in themselves and grace cannot be had without them.

By the Inquisition, the Church took away the right of private opinion in religious matters and denied existence on earth to anyone daring to dissent from its dogmas. This is the explicit teaching of Thomas Aquinas, as it was the deliberate practice of the Roman See from Innocent III down to days of the Spanish Inquisition and of Paul Caraffa with his Roman Inquisition.

To these three mighty constructions, the Reformers opposed the open Bible as every man's Book, and the teaching that justification is by faith in Jesus Christ, independent of works or sacerdotal ministrations.

As for the papacy, to Luther the pope came to be an antichrist, "the very worst that all devils with all their power could do." Luther's words were vehement and, when it came to calling names, as one of my students once put it, Luther "could beat them all." But the provocation was great. If we choose to forget Alexander VI, recently deceased, his mistresses, the open marriage of his children from the Vatican, his sale of cardinals' hats; if we forget Julius II, whom Luther called the sanguinary pope, clad in armor and fighting without mercy against the French in upper Italy, himself also the father of children; if we forget Leo X, entering the Vatican with the frivolous words, "God has given us the papacy, let us enjoy it," his pawning of the tiara to keep up the extravagances of his court, his duplicity in politics—if we choose to forget such papal practices, we must remember that Leo X called Luther the boar out of the woods and the wild beast of the forest, a heretic—and heretics were

burnt—and that the cardinal legates, Cajetan and Alexander, called Luther “that German beast,” the “pernicious monster,” that “scoundrel and dog for whom the iron and fire were prepared.” No one was in doubt that they were seeking Luther’s blood, and, from the broad human standpoint, the monk of Wittenberg was no more guilty in using strong words than was the man at Rome or the cardinals in Augsburg and at Worms. Of one thing we are pretty certain—that Luther, the Wittenberg monk, never sought the life of pope or cardinal or commended injury to their persons.

As for the sacraments, the Reformers set aside the sacerdotal function of the clergy and the sacrificial element from the Mass, and recovered for every man the right to go immediately to the throne of grace to find mercy and obtain help in every time of need.

As for the Inquisition, we confess with regret that the Reformers did not give full swing to the principle, enunciated by Luther at the outset, that it is against the will of the Spirit that compulsion be used in matters of religious opinion. It is quite possible, as Nicholas Paulus shows in his work on religious toleration, to prove that the Protestants erred badly and not infrequently in this matter, even to the dealing with the presumed witches at Salem. Nevertheless, the Reformers were headed in the right direction and, among Protestant peoples, the right of private judgment found expression in William the Silent’s edict of religious tolerance, 1576, in the noble expression of the Westminster divines that “God alone is Lord of the conscience,” and in the article giving “soul liberty,” which that spiritual and somewhat heady descendant of Calvin, Roger Williams, put into the constitution of one of our colonies. The fundamental principle of individual sovereignty expressly taught by the Reformers or implied in their teaching, gradually found for itself expression in the rights of conscience. Protestantism has not been ashamed to make apologies for its errors of the past. But an explicit apology we have yet to hear made by a Roman pontiff, as for example for the establishment of the Inqui-

sition, the invalidation of Magna Charta or the decree of Innocent VIII ordering the burning of witches or the bulls pronouncing Bible Societies as pests and Protestant teachers in Rome as worse than prostitutes.

The Reformers have been called Revolutionaries. So they were. They destroyed and they built up. A new era was not otherwise possible. The plea that an orderly current of religious reform was moving in Europe is hardly worth consideration until we have set aside contemporary popes, beginning, say, with Sixtus IV and Alexander VI and ending with Alessandro Farnese and Julius III, or until the testimonies of all the Reformers are set aside, from Luther's and Tyndale's to the very last of them, as ignorant or malicious perjuries. Stigmatizing epithets heaped upon Luther and the persons of the other Reformers will not be sufficient permanently to darken the Reformation and discredit its principles, any more than the fires at Smithfield and Oxford and St. Andrews could burn up the good names of British martyrs. The main question will always be: Did the teachings of the Reformers accord with the Word of God? By the Word of God those teachings stand or fall. What God may have in store for the Church in the future in bringing together into hearty fellowship and co-operation Christians, Roman Catholic and Protestant, I do not presume to be able to foresee. But Protestant Christendom will have its mission, we may be assured, so long as it remains true to the confession that Christ is the immediate Head of His Church and of every individual member of the Church, even as in the body the head is in immediate connection with every one of the members; so long as it holds to the declaration made before the powers of the world at Worms in 1521: "My conscience is bound captive in the Word of God and to do anything against conscience is unsafe and dangerous. Here I stand. I can do no otherwise. God help me. Amen."

ARTICLE II.

THE LEGACY OF THE REFORMATION.

BY REV. J. A. HALL, D.D.

The German Reformation of the 16th century under the direction of Martin Luther differed from that in other lands in this; that it was distinctly a religious movement. It concerned itself with the great questions of the soul. It sought to give and did give a Scriptural answer to the question as to how the soul may find pardon and peace with God. It was this fact that gave to the Reformation in Germany its tremendous drive: that made it a living dynamic the pulsations of which were felt not only in Germany but throughout Europe. For at last the greatest, the most insistent of all questions is the one that seeks an answer to the interrogation—How may the soul find peace with God: how can a man that is a sinner be justified in God's sight? But this was not the question that was uppermost in the minds of the reformers in lands other than Germany; nor can it be said that the reformation elsewhere was primarily religious.

The Reformation in Italy under the lead of Jerome Savonarola was ethical and political. It sought to reform the civil and social life of the people, particularly of Florence. It was a protest against the shameless immorality that everywhere corrupted the Church and society. Looking outward Savonarola saw the men and women of his times given over to all manner of moral abuses. For in truth it may be said that the moral tone of Christendom had never been lower than it was at the time in Italy. The most brutal selfishness stalked shamelessly abroad. Murder had become a trade and poisoning an art and both had become the policy of princes. The Church was worst of all. Through the example of the papal court Italy had lost all piety and religion. And it

was the Church, as Machiavelli tells us, that was to blame for the abandoned wickedness.

Now, it was against all this that the soul of Savonarola revolted. And Savonarola was unquestionably not only the greatest but the most saintly man of his times. Austere in personal life, uncompromising in his attitude to sin he was at once a moral reformer and saint. Therefore the cathedral of San Marco resounded with denunciations of the vices of his times. He arraigned the Pope, the rulers of Florence, and the people. He spoke as a fearless prophet of the Lord. His message to his age was: "The world is very evil: the times are waxing late: the Church will be scourged and that soon." What he sought above all was that the Church and society might be reformed. But his weakness was this: that he attacked the Pope and the Medici rather than the falsehoods upon which the iniquities that he hated were based. This was the cause of his failure. For no reformation can be permanent that fails to dig up the roots out of which the evil that it seeks to eradicate springs. Savonarola was contented to lop off the branches but did not dig up the roots. He rebuked evil but had nothing to put in its place. So it came that so long as he lived his influence was felt. But when his voice was hushed in martyrdom the evils that he so detested returned. The house that had only been swept and garnished was soon filled with devils worse than the first. For there can be no great or lasting reform that is not based on doctrine, and no error can be finally dislodged except as it is supplanted by truth.

Nor can it be said that the reformation in Switzerland was distinctly a religious movement. It too was in a large measure ethical and political. Its great leader, Zwingli, had never gone through the terrible spiritual conflicts which had marked Luther's life and made him the man he was. No deep sense of personal sin had ever haunted him, or given insistence to the question as to how the soul might be saved.

Then, too, unlike Luther whose aloofness from politi-

cal affairs was characteristic, Zwingli was largely absorbed in the civil and political concerns of his times. He believed that his mission had as much to do with politics as religion and that the reformation was to be worked out by political forces as well as spiritual.

In addition to this, Zwingli was a humanist. He was an ardent disciple of that great movement which in the fifteenth century swept over Europe known as the Renaissance, or the revival of learning. For centuries preceding, the gloomy night of the Middle Ages had brooded over Europe. It was a night of intellectual darkness, bigotry and superstition. Interest in literature, science, and philosophy had died out save here and there in a few of the monasteries, and gross ignorance and superstition everywhere prevailed. But with the revival of learning, or the renaissance, the darkness was driven back and a new day dawned. And just because undue importance is often placed on the influence of the renaissance in the way of effecting reformation, I desire to speak for a moment of that great movement.

It was, as I have said, a revival of learning. In this way it was helpful to the reformation. It did make possible a translation of the Bible. It did put into the hands of the reformers and of the scholars a tremendous weapon: for with the new knowledge it was possible to expose the falsehoods and pretensions of the Papacy in a way that would not otherwise have been possible. And for this it was used by Erasmus and many others with telling effect.

But the renaissance was not in any sense a religious movement. It was rather the opposite. It was a revival of Greek and Latin culture, literature, art, philosophy and science. It was essentially humanitarian and naturalistic, and in so far as it was this it was hostile not alone to the Catholic Church but to Christianity as well. Its foremost disciple, Erasmus, had little interest in the great doctrines and principles that gave meaning and power to the reformation as it took form in Germany. Virtually, the renaissance was a return to Greek pagan-

ism. It knew little and cared less about sin, repentance and grace. It was a mere worship of nature. Yet, as I have said, it was helpful to the reformation in a negative way. It exposed the errors and pretensions of Rome. It laughed to scorn the ignorance and claims of the Papacy and the Church. It taught men to despise monkery, the priesthood, and the entire system upon which the Papal Church was founded. It preached liberty from ecclesiastical tyranny. But it was the liberty of education, philosophy and refinement, and not the liberty of the man redeemed from sin. The renaissance would never have struck the fetters from the slave, or emancipated the soul from the burden of sin. And it could not for the reason that its spirit was heathen and not Christian. It had no conception of sin, or of the grace of the Gospel. It hated all religious doctrines. At its beginning it indeed encouraged purity of life. But it soon degenerated into moral license and sensuality. Throughout, it lacked moral earnestness and was utterly destitute of spiritual power. It is clear that a movement such as this is not to be classified with the forces that work for a religious reformation. The renaissance uttered no protest against sin, had no way of escape from its burden, and in its later development was even indifferent to morals.

Now it was by this movement that Zwingli, the greatest and most influential of the Swiss reformers, was profoundly influenced. He came to Christianity through Plato and Socrates. Accordingly, the deep consciousness of sin, the terrors of conscience, which were Luther's had never been his, for philosophy has no knowledge of sin. It was the shamefulness, the unworthiness, the misery of sin that occupied his vision, rather than its guilt and deserved punishment. It was therefore but natural that the problems that concerned him most should be ethical rather than the all-important question as to how the sinner may be forgiven and justified in God's sight. The reformation, accordingly, in Switzerland, was not as it was in Germany, primarily a religious movement.

In England the reformation, if such it may be called,

was a revolution rather than a religious awakening. Many of its leaders had no sympathy with the Lutheran movement. They wished to see the Church reformed, to have her power curtailed, and that England should assume a more independent attitude toward the Pope. Instead of following the lead of the more pronounced religious leaders, Henry the Eighth impressed upon the English Church his own substantially Catholic theology. All his life he was a Catholic from conviction as well as from traditional assent. The English reformation was too much alloyed with political elements to be classified among religious movements. By Henry, as well as by Edward, Luther was regarded as a heretic, and by the former his books were commanded to be burnt.

And what was true of England was also true of Scotland and the countries of the north. The reformation in Germany stands alone in the great awakening of the sixteenth century as a positively religious movement. It is true that every other country in Europe felt its pulsations. The writings of Luther were read everywhere in spite of the prohibitions uttered against them by Pope and rulers. They served as a guide and comfort to earnest souls everywhere who were in search for truth. But it was in Germany that the reformation, as a distinctly religious movement, had free course and was glorified. And this came from the fact that its inspiring genius was the greatest of all the reformers in the sphere of religion—the greatest of all spheres. In fact it may, without exaggeration, be said that the German "reformation was embodied in Martin Luther; that it lived in him and in no one else and that its inner religious history may be best studied in the record of his spiritual experience and in the growth of his religious convictions." (Lindsay, p. 193).

Now, for the task of giving utterance and direction to the religious aspirations of his times, Luther was peculiarly qualified. He was by nature the spiritual descendant of the great Apostle Paul. For twelve centuries Paul (and I mean by Paul the great doctrine for which

he stood) was dead. His doctrine of justification by faith alone in the finished work of Christ had ceased to be proclaimed, and in its stead a doctrine of justification by works had been taught in the Church. But Paul lived and again spoke in Luther. And confessedly Luther was a religious genius. With the exception of Paul his like had not, nor since has, lived. Nor can it be said that he was the product of his times or the creation of his environment. On the contrary, he was raised up and qualified by spiritual constitution and experience for the work that he was called upon to do. It is so with all really great men. For no great man is the product of his environment. He is a direct creation of God and comes not until Providence sends him. So came Luther.

In Eisleben, in Saxony, on the tenth of November, 1483, he was born. He came into the world as all who have been the heralds of some living truth or doctrine have come, possessed of a unique religious constitution. This is essential to the religious leader for the reason that no doctrine is rightly learned in the schools. It is conceived and expanded in the soul's experience. It is something the content of which must needs be experienced and lived, before it can be understood or proclaimed with conviction and power. Before Luther could proclaim anew to the world the doctrine of justification by faith he himself had to learn by experience all that it meant to a soul burdened by sin. All the experience of sin's burden and guilt; all the emptiness and vanity of self-righteousness; all the joy of forgiven sin and acceptance with God, had to be his. For all this his unique religious constitution qualified him. For Luther's was a nature quick to revolt at sin. His was a conscience to which sin was a most terrible thing, that made sin a burden from which his soul longed above all to be free. It was this unwonted sensitiveness of his spiritual nature that compelled Luther to seek a way of relief from the awful burden of guilt. It was this sensitiveness that forced from his lips the oft repeated cry, My sin—My sin. And it was this that was the cause of the joy that he felt when he saw that through faith a man is justified before God.

But, though Luther felt as few have felt the enormity of sin, it must not be thought that he was a sinner above others. On the contrary, from his youth he was regarded by his contemporaries as the embodiment of piety. All spoke of his sensitiveness to religious impressions of all kinds in his earlier years. While he was inside the convent, whether before or after he had found deliverance from his troubles of soul, his fellows regarded him as a model of piety. In later days, when he stood forth as a reformer, he became such a power in the hearts of men of all sorts and ranks because he was seen to be a thoroughly pious man. Albert Dürer the great painter and intimate friend of Luther almost worshiped him as a saint. He called him "the pious man": the "follower of the Lord": and "of the true Christian faith." And indeed it could not have been otherwise. For it is never the soul hardened by sin that feels most its burden and guilt. Sin deadens the conscience, and robs the soul of that sensitiveness apart from which the exceeding sinfulness of sin cannot be experienced. It is your Pauls, your Augustines, your St. Francis, and not your Neros and Caligulas, to whom sin is most grievous. So it was with Luther. If his consciousness of the deep guilt of sin was greater than others, it was because of his tenderness of conscience and not of the greatness of his personal guilt.

Now, it was to this natural quickness of conscience that his early training and experience greatly contributed. He was cradled in poverty. He had to beg, singing for alms from door to door. Thus he escaped the contaminating influences which usually attend the possession of riches and a life of material luxury.

Nor was it an accident that he was born poor. For poverty is the foster mother of great men. Among things, and not among the shadows of things, the great soul must needs grow. His mother was a woman of all work. To her fell the hard task of nurturing and in a large measure providing for the bodily necessities of her children. Hers it was to carry on her frail shoulders the wood from the forest to prepare the daily meals and to

protect her offspring from the blasts of Thuringian winter. In these toils and privations Luther shared, for in those times it was required of the first born to bear a part of the maternal and paternal burdens.

Discipline in the home was severe and stringent. Little charity was shown for the natural indiscretions of youth or its thoughtlessness. Accordingly, life in the home was stern and unrelieved by the joy and sunshine of youth. So rigorous was the discipline, so solicitous were his parents that their son should escape the indiscretions of youth, and so severe were the punishments of even insignificant offenses, that Luther at one time fled from his home and refused to return until his father at last won him back by kindness. He tells us that on a certain occasion he was so severely beaten by his mother for taking an insignificant nut that blood flowed from the wound. It was this well-meant but unwonted severity, added to a natural sensitiveness of moral nature, that caused Luther so to bewail his sins against God, and that made him constantly mourn over supposed sins often aggravating that into a transgression in which there was no moral wrong.

Then, too, his conception of God but added to his terror when he thought of his sins. It was the medieval conception. He thought of God, not as he afterward learned to think of Him, as a kind and merciful father, but on the contrary as a cruel and exacting judge. He tells us that he trembled with terror whenever he looked at the stained glass windows in the parish church in which as a lad he was accustomed to pray, and saw the frowning face of Jesus, who, seated on a rainbow and with flaming sword, was coming to judge him he knew not when. So it came that he felt himself constantly pursued, the victim of the divine wrath.

And this judgment seemed to be confirmed by two experiences that came to him. On Easter Day, as he was on a visit to his parents, and had proceeded several miles from Erfurt, the sword which he carried, as was the custom of students, pierced the artery of his leg. This he

regarded as a judgment of God on account of his sins, and he cried loudly and anxiously for Mary to intercede in his behalf.

The second experience was that which came to him when returning home alone from the festival of the visitation of Mary. Having nearly reached his home, a vivid flash of lightning quivered before him. Trembling with alarm he fell to the ground and exclaimed, "Help dear St. Anna, I will be a monk." Thus it came to pass that because of his exceeding spiritual sensitiveness, his early training and experience, sin became to Luther a most dreadful thing. When he thought of his sins he felt that God was against him: that he was lost and that the doom of the guilty awaited him. The lurid flames of hell, and the pale shades which are the permanent background of Dante's Paradise were ever present. How could he escape the one and gain the other?

Well, now, is it any wonder that with him the question, the question the importance of which transcended all others, should be—How can a man that is a sinner be justified in God's sight? And what was the answer that the Church had to give to a soul thus burdened by sin? It was this: Escape from the world; flee to the monastery; scourge thyself; give thyself to prayer and fasting; by penitence and works of righteousness thou must work out thine own salvation. It was the righteousness of works, the everlasting delusion of the natural man, that the soul must needs save itself. So Luther entered the monastery in the vain hope that by exclusion from the world, by fasting, and prayer, and vigils, and bodily afflictions he could do a work which none other than the Son of God, and He only by the sacrifice of Himself could do.

I need not dwell on Luther's experience in the monastery; how he prayed, and fasted, and kept nightly vigil until his body was wasted. All that is a familiar story. But it was all in vain. It is true that gleams of comfort now and then came to him, but they were transient. At last he was found by Staupitz, who saw the difficulty with

which Luther was contending. It was this man who led the young monk into the light, and brought him to see the truth that righteousness in God's sight is not by the deeds of the law: that it is a thing provided in Christ, and that it becomes a man's own possession by faith in and through Christ Jesus. Slowly the truth dawned until the full vision of the relation of the believing man to God came to him with all the force of a personal revelation, and the storm-tossed soul was at rest. He found by experience what Paul and Augustine and St. Francis before him had found, that justification in the sight of God is by faith, and experienced that peace which comes to the soul when it ceases to trust in self but in God alone for salvation. It was then, as he tells us, that he felt "as if born again: as though heaven's gates stood full open and that he was joyfully entering therein."

It was the rediscovery of this truth of justification by faith alone that constituted the legacy of the reformation to the world. It is this truth, buried for centuries and discovered anew by Luther, that has made the generations that have followed incomparably richer than they hitherto had been. For in this great doctrine as in a fruitful seed there is contained the germs of all that is worthy in thought or life; all that has power to inspire joy in the life that now is, all that gives assurance of salvation in the life that is to be. For what is there that is worthy, what in the sphere of our social, national or religious life, that is not embraced in that great doctrine? It is the Magna Charta of freedom. It is manumission from all anxiety, all fear of the future or of death, for faith lifts a man above the world and constitutes him a true Son of God. Therefore it delivers him from all that has power to enslave. A Christian man, said Luther, is the most free lord of all and subject to none.

But here, in passing, I must say a word concerning Luther's conception of faith, for no one can see as Luther saw what faith is able to do, until with him he is able to see what faith really is. You know the question is often asked, How can faith alone save? And is it at last true

that there is no saving merit in good works? The followers of Luther have often been reproached for holding with the great reformer that works in the sphere of salvation are of no avail and that faith is the only possible righteousness before God. But the criticism is at once answered the moment we lay hold of Luther's conception of faith itself.

Faith, with Luther, was not merely an intellectual matter as the Church then held. It is not belief in the Church, its priesthood, its traditions, or its dogmas. It is not mere belief in anything, not even in the Bible. It is in no sense subscription to creeds, or acceptance of the declarations of synods or councils. In fact, faith, just because it is faith, makes a man free from all priestly or ecclesiastical authority. Faith, with Luther, is self-commitment; the yielding of the whole self in filial obedience and confidence to God. It is therefore the utter abandonment of all trust in self or in our own righteousness, and the whole hearted acceptance of the righteousness provided by God in Christ Jesus. It is that act of the whole person whereby the salvation provided in Christ is accepted and made the sinner's own. Therefore it justifies; therefore it saves. And faith is and does all this not because there is any merit in faith itself, but because it accepts the righteousness which God has provided for all men in His Son, Christ Jesus. With Luther salvation is a thing that cannot be worked out or merited. It is the free and unmerited gift of God's grace which it is the function of faith to receive. Faith, with Luther, is the hand that reaches out to receive the salvation, the righteousness that God offers.

But all this, vast as it is, does not fill the whole circle of Luther's conception of faith. Faith, as Luther conceived it, incorporates Christ with the believer. Faith so unites the soul to Christ that Christ and the believer become so to speak one flesh. By virtue of this union a new life is begotten within, man is born anew and from above. This is the secret of good works. Because through union with Christ the tree is made good, because

the new and heavenly life is born in the soul through faith, good works are certain to follow. They are the natural and inevitable fruit of the new life begotten within through faith. Wherever faith is good works are. Faith and works are inseparable; they go together for neither is without the other.

Such, then, was Luther's conception of faith. And such is the faith that saves. It saves because it satisfies all of the divine requirements, for what more can God ask than that the soul should surrender itself to Him in trustful loving surrender. And just because faith is all this it is the true and only righteousness in God's sight. It is the only possible righteousness for sinful men. It justifies because in view of such faith past sin is remitted and a future of righteousness effectually guaranteed in the experience of the sinner.

Now, as I have already said, it is this Pauline conception of faith and its power to justify that constitutes the legacy left by the Reformation to the world. It includes all that for which the German Reformation really stood all that made it of real and lasting benefit to succeeding generations. For this doctrine of justification by faith alone contains within it immense and far-reaching possibilities. It has reversed the current of the world's history and turned it into new and diviner channels. It has given liberty to the captive, dispelled the fear of death, comforted the sin burdened and given the full assurance of hope to all who have trusted themselves to it. It has immeasurably enriched life and glorified it. In fact the doctrine of justification by faith has proven itself a spiritual dynamic capable of producing vast and beneficent results in all the spheres of life and activity. I have space to refer to but three of these results that have issued from this great truth.

(1). For one thing, it has given religious freedom to the world. And it has done this because it affirms the universal priesthood of believers. The doctrine of justification by faith and the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers are one and the same. And the truth

of the universal priesthood of believers is at last but a declaration of the equality of men based on the fact that all are alike children of God. It denies the mediation of pope or priest and affirms that the God-given right of every man is that of "coming boldly to a throne of grace that he may obtain mercy and grace to help in every time of need."

It was the universally accepted power of the priesthood, the notion that God could not be approached except through the mediation of the priest, that for centuries enslaved Europe and made religious freedom impossible. Everywhere the idea prevailed that the priesthood barred, and was able to bar, the way to God. Think of what that meant. When a man or a woman felt sorrow for sin they were instructed to go, not to God, but to a man, often of immoral life, and confess their sins to him for the sole reason that he was a priest. When they wanted to hear the comforting words of pardon spoken it was not from God but from the priest that the assurance was supposed to come. It was thought to be within the power of the priest to withhold pardon and to place the soul under an interdict. The Church, that is, the clergy who were by the theory enabled to refuse to the communicant the grace of God, barred all access to the God who had revealed Himself in Christ Jesus. By a stroke of the pen the pope could prevent a whole nation, so it was taught, from approaching God because he could prevent priests from performing the usual sacramental acts which alone brought Him near. An interdict meant spiritual death to the district on which it fell; and on the medieval theory it was more deadly to the spiritual life than the worst of plagues, the Black Death itself, was to the body. An interdict made the plainest intellect see, understand and shudder at the awful and mysterious powers which a mediatorial priesthood was said to possess.

It was against this monstrous and soul-enslaving falsehood that Luther proclaimed the doctrine of justification by faith, or, what is the same, the universal priest-

hood of believers. He stated it with his usual graphic emphasis in that tract of his which he always said contained the marrow of his message—"Concerning Christian Liberty." And when Luther proclaimed that truth, wherever the message was heard and believed the shackles of religious despotism were broken and the emancipated souls of men entered into the experience of that freedom which is the inalienable heritage of all who trust in God alone for salvation. It was the death-knell to every form of religious oppression. It was manumission from the fear of all that presumed to stand between the soul and God, whether it be priest, or pope, or bulls, or interdicts, or what not. For no soul can longer be enslaved when the truth is once grasped that nothing can bar it from personal access to God, "That neither death nor life nor angels nor principalities nor powers nor things present nor things to come nor height nor depth nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Jesus Christ our Lord." Little wonder that Savonarola on the day of his ignominious execution in Florence, when the Bishop of Varona read the papal anathema—"Jerome Savonarola I separate thee from the Church militant and from the Church triumphant," replied—"from the Church militant you may but from the Church triumphant never, for this does not belong to you." To lay hold of the great truth of the universal priesthood of believers is to be emancipated from every form of ecclesiastical oppression.

(2). A second blessing bequeathed by the Reformation to the world is that of civil liberty. The emancipation of the soul carries with it emancipation from every form of bondage. For what is the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers but a declaration of the equality of all men in the sight of God? What is it but the affirmation of the principle embodied in the Declaration of Independence, that "all men are created free and equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." What is it, in a word, but the affirmation of the universal brother-

hood of man based on the fact that all are alike children of God; that just because we are brethren no man or class of men have a right to oppress their fellows?

It is the denial of the universal sonship of men with God that makes despotism possible. For despotism, in whatever form, is founded on the falsehood which denies the equality of men and affirms the divine right of kings, and emperors, and czars, to lord it over their fellows. Except on that falsehood no imperial or autocratic sovereignty has ever been or can ever be built. And what is more: this truth of the equality of men based on the universal priesthood of believers is a moral dynamic that means the overthrow of every form of oppression. No man, believing that truth, can find it in his heart to oppress another, and no nation or people by whom it is really accepted will long consent to be deprived of their God-given rights.

So I say that the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers proclaimed to the world anew by Martin Luther is the corner-stone not alone of religious but also of civil liberty. It is the basis upon which all democracies, all republics rest. It is the rock upon which every form of despotism is destined at last to be wrecked.

Is it then a cause for wonder that in these times when empires and dynasties are crumbling; when in every quarter of the globe "Rachel sits weeping for her children and will not be comforted because they are not," is it I ask, any wonder that by some Luther and the Reformation should be blamed? Or is it a matter for surprise that by our Catholic friends as well as by those who cry peace, peace, when in the eternal order there can be no peace, that the question should be asked—Is not Protestantism a failure? Is not all this horror, and waste, and bloodshed, and death the outcome of Luther's doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, or, if you please, of the equality of all men in the sight of God? Does not the blame for it all rest with Luther and Protestantism? Would it not have been different had Martin Luther not lived? Perhaps it would. It may be that save for the

monk of Erfurt Europe and England and America might even now be at peace. But it would be the peace of intellectual and moral lethargy and stagnation. It would be the peace of stagnant putrescence, the noisome peace of the grave. It would not be that living peace for which the oppressed of all ages have long hoped and waited. It would not be a righteous peace because it would not be based upon the equality of all men in the sight of God and the recognition of human rights. A righteous and living peace can never come until the universal brotherhood of man founded on the fact of our common sonship with God is universally accepted and practically applied in all of our relations one to another. So long as bigotry, and selfishness, and class distinctions, and falsehood occupy the places of authority, there can be no peace that is worthy of the name. Not until truth triumphs over falsehood; not until righteousness triumphs over wrong; not until brotherhood wins its victory over selfishness will the morning of that glad day dawn when

Peace with her olives crowned shall stretch
Her wings from shore to shore
No trump shall rouse the rage of war
Nor murderous cannon roar.

Let us make up our minds once and for all that war will not cease from the earth until wrong entrenched behind cannon and navies, and falsehood incarnate in czars and emperors and dynasties, shall perish forever from the earth. "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword." He whom the prophet declared to be the Prince of peace Himself said—"I came not to send peace on the earth but a sword." And just because He is the King of righteousness as well as the Prince of peace, His sword will not rest in its scabbard until righteousness shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

No, the blame of the war rests not with Luther and Protestantism. Nor is Christianity a failure because it has failed to hold in leash the going forth of God's venge-

ful lightning upon all those who for selfish ends have opposed themselves to the march of God's eternal truth. It was not upon Hercules who turned the purifying river into King Augeas' stables that the responsibility rested for the confusion that followed. It is never truth but falsehood; not the doctrine of human equality with its corollary of human rights, but its denial by czars and autocrats of every name that make war possible. It is selfishness, the lust of power and empire that breed war. As peace rests on the practical recognition of the equality of men, so does civil liberty, for the latter is not possible in the absence of the former. But the basis of both is laid in Luther's great doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers.

(3). There yet remains a factor in the legacy of the Reformation concerning which I must say a word, for it is the most important of all. I mean the answer that it gave to the question: How can the sinful soul find peace with God and assurance of salvation? Until that question is answered, and the sin-burdened soul is able to rest securely in the fact that it is saved, peace and joy are impossible experiences.

Yet to this question the Latin Church gave no answer. It did not profess nor indeed could it give certitude. To a correspondent who demanded the assurance of forgiven sin Pope Gregory the Great replied that such assurance was difficult and unprofitable. By the Council of Trent it was declared that no one can know with the certainty which cannot be subject to mistake that he has obtained grace with God. But no earnest soul can endure to be tossed forever on the sea of doubt and mere opinion. It demands assurance. It would know of a certainty here and now and not when it is forever too late whether it is really saved.

This certainty was what Luther sought and found in the doctrine of justification by faith alone, for it is there and nowhere else that it can be found. And when he found it and experienced for himself the joy of salvation, in the strength of this mighty conviction he stood with

a majesty unsurpassed confronting the world that had been and that which was to be. It made no difference to him that he stood alone opposed by all the sacred traditions of Latin Christendom running so far back in the past that they seemed coeval with Christianity itself. He stood before his age with the uplifted Bible, and the truth which he there read so corresponded with the experience which was his that it made no difference if, as he said, a thousand Augustines or a thousand Cyprians or a thousand councils were against him.

It is this great doctrine of justification by faith, first proclaimed by Paul, buried for centuries and rediscovered by Luther, that constitutes the most priceless heritage of the Reformation. "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God" is the triumphant declaration of Paul. And this peace which faith brings is not a thing that is deferred until life's stress and conflicts are over, and the City of God the New Jerusalem dawn on the vision. It is an experience that may be ours here and now in the midst of the battle. It is an experience that is certain to come to all who cease to trust in their own righteousness, and trust in God alone for salvation.

And this priceless legacy bequeathed by the Reformation is in a peculiar sense our own as sons of the great reformer. In no Church of Christendom is it proclaimed with such an understanding of its vast meaning or with such conviction and power. It is her doctrine of justification by faith alone that gives to the Lutheran Church her right to live. So long as sin lasts, so long as the insistent question is asked: How can a man that is a sinner be justified in God's sight, just so long will her message continue to be the gladdest and most soul-cheering of all; a Gospel of great joy to all people.

Mansfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE III.

LUTHER IN OUR DAY.

BY REV. EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.

This summer there was erected, at a cost of one hundred thousand dollars, in Vernon Park, Germantown, a statue of Pastorius, the founder of Germantown. Hardly had the last pieces of the figures composing the monument been put in place before a group of carpenters began covering the figures and massive pedestal with boards. There the hidden stone sculptures will remain beneath this gray imprisonment of wood until the great war is over and the anti-German spirit has somewhat subsided. This action is false to the spirit of history.

I am glad that the scholarship of America has no such intention towards a greater German than Pastorius—Luther. We are not seeking to cover up his massive figure, nor seeking to delay the honor due him on this four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation's inauguration. Rather do we gladly unveil afresh the courage, faith and devotion of this man of God before the American people because in his spirit and purpose he incarnated for us that spiritual and political independence which lies at the basis of all religious and social progress.

Nothing can be in more vivid contradiction than the Prussianism of 1917 and Luther nailing his ninety-five theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg. One stands for an imperial autocracy claiming divine sovereignty, the other for the right of individual conscience and universal kingship. The seeds of democracy are scattered by every great utterance of the Reformer. His revolutionary words and acts are the prophecies of popular sovereignty. The historic conditions in which he wrought made impossible a divorce between the State and the Church. The masses were unprepared for popular government, but every implication of the right of

private judgment in religion and the recovery of the universal priesthood of believers made autocracy in Church and State to totter and finally fall. Lutheranism in its pristine form and Prussianism have nothing in common, least of all here in America where we have wrought to its logical conclusions the great emancipation begun by Luther.

We must not attempt to interpret Luther apart from his experience, his age and his country. The elemental note in his experience was that of a human soul, living in theological atmosphere of mediaevalism, and battling for a sense of forgiveness of sin and peace with God. That great human struggle was met and solved by his recovery of the Pauline experience of justification by faith. God's grace alone is the Christian's basis of peace and strength. The second great fact in his life was his emergency from a loyal priesthood in a corrupt Church into the scriptural repudiation of contemporary ecclesiastical assumptions and contradictions of the apostolic church. This was an intellectual and moral task of the greatest magnitude for a man of his position and age. His third great venture was to restate in simplest form the essentials of the faith in the light of the scholarship of the sixteenth century. This he did wonderfully well in scattered letters, catechisms, hymns, and in his special treatises. He did not pretend to offer a systematized body of doctrines or polity. He worked at the heart of religion and had to leave to his followers the systematization of dogma. We see now in the light of a fuller history of the man that he was a child of his age and carried over into his Protestant thinking strains and traits of mediaeval thinking. No man was better fitted to head the revolt among the Teutonic peoples than this man of giant soul and childlike faith.

Four hundred years have passed. Across the face of Europe has swept the voice of the Reformer awakening popes, kings, theologians, humanists, teachers and statesmen to a new sense of responsibility, freedom and progress. Luther was not the end but the beginning of new

advances in the political, moral and religious ideals of the world. Four hundred years have brought fresh knowledge and development in science, political theory, social life, industrial adjustment, historical study and the philosophical interpretation of the universe and life. To interpret Scripture to-day from the literalistic view-point of Luther would be to deny the Luther spirit. But to hold to his Christological standard of theological interpretation is the only hope of the future Church. We are separated by a millenium of thought from the critical thought standpoint of Luther; but we are one with him in his devotion to Jesus Christ as the divinely human unveiling of God in history. Luther's passion for truth, his utter absence of all fear of man, his recovery of the central fact of the believer's personal touch with God through faith, his hatred of all moral turpitude within and without the Church, his utter devotion to the cause of righteousness, his masterful, serene faith in God's love and care,—these are his and should be ours forevermore.

Philadelphia, Pa.

ARTICLE IV.

LIBERTY.

BY REV. JOHN ERLER, A.M., PH.D.

The crux of the philosophy of redemption lies in the problem of freedom and conscience. Without this notion of a self gifted with the power to discern and the divine gift of self-activity, no religion could save our human order from a mechanical and senseless operation throughout the years. The blackness of fatalism would overcast the mind, and soul would be at war with its earthly mission. Yet has the question of freedom and conscience been debated from age to age; and the very profundity of these two simple notions makes for a constant misunderstanding. New truths are not brought to light without dispute, neither are old ones confirmed without doubt. Plain though the solution is, this is hedged about with difficulties. It is these which give charm and freshness to any discussion of world-old problems. It is a radical mistake to suppose that the arguments require no champion. Ever new is this main miracle, "that thou art thou, with power on thine own act and on the world." So says Tennyson; and a great deal of recent discussion has raised new issues.

This view allows one of the deepest insights of philosophy. In one sense man is not free if he is bound by the right, but looked at from the eternal point of view he is absolutely free. Of course we are limited in time and circumstance. But it must be remembered that we are parts of the eternal order. We are to act with all eternity before us at a glance, choosing to do those things with the Lord which make for righteousness. In this work of perfecting life and the world our consciousness has a part, though we are not morally free to change laws in this world. As children of the eternal Creator of the World, we are moral and free. God eludes our reason

but reveals Himself in the conscience, which is the guiding principle and rule of action.

In its entirety the world appears to us in space and time as a system of phenomena rigidly bound by laws—a well described system of facts. But we are not impotent pieces in the game played by the world-will. Sometimes will is too free. It is only when we give way to unreasoned impulse, blind and unconscious, creatures of mood and hereditary temperament, knowing not our choices, that we do not enjoy this freedom, and that we are doing what some ancestor may have chosen to do, not we. Not hopelessly is mind tied up in nervous mechanism. We are continually looking before and after, and are beyond the mercy of time. We are not a series of events without interconnection, for the gift of reflection is ours. Self-consciousness in fact transcends time, and looks upon life as a symphony with purpose and meaning, not one poor thing after another.

Hence the value of philosophy. Practical men, men with vast business responsibility, do indeed find it profitable to study it, for it raises the mind into a sense of freedom, gives it an "indescribable elevation above earthly affairs," as Fichte said in a letter to his betrothed. One finds out that man's will is free, and that not happiness but worthiness is the end of being. One must trust to feeling, though the sophistry of determinism is hard to refute.

Instinct tells us that mind has the power to act, and to be reasonably and justly responsible for a course of conduct as its originator. This is aside from involuntary reflex action, which plays so large a part in our being. In the government of conduct according to ethical conceptions formed by the understanding, is true liberty found. Though thought and attention direct motives of course along lines of mental action at all times, the laws of thought and mental operation. Some see in volition the result of heredity and environment plus a thought which had its origin in a previous thought, and so backwards, thus depriving mind of all initiative and causal

energy. There must be a free cause, if we are other than creatures of reflex action. In studying the intellectual side of the processes of consciousness, what accounts for the thoughts through which motive is shaped, the series of deliberations and the prompting of corrective feelings, but voluntary unenforced action. To this determinism can give no answer. Though the evidence in favor of determinism is cumulative and steadily growing, it will ever leave a free area which it cannot trespass.

There is a self-directing energy which calls in and concentrates attention. This prosecutes reflection until the desired end has been reached under the guidance of moral law. We call this miraculous source of energy will power—one of the most unique forces within all knowledge. It is the conscious agent of the ego. Attention is concentrated by it, to a great extent, and thought regulated, though this be at times more difficult. Intelligence wills its own procedure, in those spheres in which it is properly sovereign, and nothing can shake this belief in a determined and confident mind of an active, occidental cast. Christianity has this message of freedom for us of the West, as fatalism is the peculiar inheritance of the Orient, erroneous though instinct declare it.

Personality itself is will directing conscious self-intelligence according to individual lines of motive. We are not slaves to the Moral Law, but render obedience to it only, as the result of deliberate resolution. There must be self-directed thought, motive, purpose, action, or moral agency cannot exist, and an injunction to conform to the laws of God, such as the categorical imperative, would be totally unmeaning. We are free to deliberate, and hence are free, for conduct must result therefrom. As Spinoza states, "I say

that a thing is free which exists and acts
by the sole necessity of its nature."

This view is amply confirmed by the host of philosophers who have made the history of thought. The rest

are in the minority. We have in a great number of instances the power to act or not act, according to the determination of the will, and no impediment to such conduct exists where we have a choice; nay we may choose the more difficult course in order to pique this sense. I ought implies I can. Reason is of course required, for it makes its deduction from known laws. We are not dependent upon the infinite series of actions which went before; we are not the last of a series, but always the first, though it appear to confute the doctrine of causality. Independent of the laws that govern matter is mind.

Above all, conscience shows us the moral law. Kant has reasserted its absolute existence as something in every respect rational and absolute, nay, even indifferent to private wishes and present happiness, and like will and reason directly known to us: independent and sublime as the heavens. It says "Do thy duty," sternly and unwaveringly. It orders us to live as if God were present here and about us in this world of sense, making of us the ministers and instruments of the divine law, though the eye of sense proclaim Him not, and theoretic reason is weak. This is not vain and vague enthusiasm, mere fancy by gazing fed, but is an intrinsic and inherent sense. By it we must act as if God were our constant companion, visibly and audibly appearing unto us, even as an advising friend. Can anything be more intimate than the voice of conscience? It is God-given. A man sure of his duty is sure that the right ought to win. In this world of sense it does not always win; but it can if God is at the helm, He the all-powerful well-wisher of the whole visible and invisible world-order. This sublime conception should be frequently pondered over.

Conscience, reason, and will should go hand in hand. If they do, conscience can be relied upon under all circumstances to lead man unerringly on the right path, though great be the sacrifice. Casuistry and obscurity make this point difficult, but after every doubt has been dispelled, and wrong results confuted, this moral law stands out in its naked purity. Those facts that are

deemed exceptions are in fact in thorough accord to the moral law, for there are ultimately no exceptions, whether in peace or war, for a good result or ill—the moral law speaks its one claim: So act that you would have your act the rule and law of all future conduct for all mankind.

Conscience must be recognized as a separate and distinct mental power or faculty, endowed with the power of recognizing universal truth, with a central place and a regulative function in life. It is not a form of feeling nor a combination of feelings, but regulative sense of truth, to be carefully distinguished from emotional feeling, as for instance remorse. It gives an authority to acts not entirely sanctioned by the affections or emotions. Intelligence directs these feelings, but all are subordinate to moral law. There is nothing so incompetent as untrained desire or emotion to lead aright. It needs a moral approving and disapproving faculty, a separate principle of reflection, enthroned above these, and entirely superior. Conscience projects itself through all our sensibilities with its sense of the infinite nature of duty. Like the sense of sight, it makes self-evident the truth perceived without however conferring any new aspects on the truths known except that of compulsion, and submission to its findings. It wants us to have no law but ourselves, and to be better than the world. While it is undoubtedly true that errors are made through a mistaken sense of duty, it follows that the false can be detected, and hence there is as yet a power to guide aright if it but see the right.

There are of course many conflicts of duty, such that what would be right for one would be wrong for another, each following the dictates of conscience, when conscience fails to make distinctions. Causistry here enters in. Precise rules for the guidance of conduct are becoming more and more difficult. The moral self is however disciplined through these questionings. It would be foolish to be excessively punctilious, and so be the victim of delay and cowardice, fussy over details of behavior—even for “conscience sake.” Largeness and immediacy of spirit

characterize a magnanimous mind. But unfaithfulness and carelessness in duty are equally to be condemned, as extreme forms. There are many morally color blind, standing at both extremes, but they are quite unfortunate, and outside of this discussion. No one can usurp the place of conscience for any other man, but must experiment in the school of life, as particular problems of conduct can only be solved by actual conduct. In the moral sphere experiment guided by sufficient tact is admissible; but this is no concession to temporizing. The moral law is still the supreme guide, and its immediacy has still to be determined. The rules of society, its customs and separate products, are not an independent source for the guidance of conduct. But a rational quality should always characterize our acts. Morality and devotion to duty generally turn out in very practical and neighborly results, if tact and sense of proportion be not sacrificed. Feeling may become too exquisite, and motives too complex for practical life. Ordinarily however there is a submerged and not entirely conscious motive for the right.

Some writers deny that there is ever a conflict of duties. Duties are not fixed conceptions of what ought to be done by all in accordance with unalterable laws. Duties change their form of expression, as they realize themselves in the individual moral consciousness from day to day. In many cases the ethical judgments cannot be made clear because of a struggle of the feelings—the ethical conflicts of the soul. This appears necessary in the very nature of man's moral development, otherwise there would never be a case of conscience at all.

To be always sure of one's duty does not argue a clear conscience, for one may be of ethically meager nature, and so deficient in a real sense of values. The battles of conscience make life richer, even at times sublime. The noblest tragedies are founded on such themes.

By conscience we do not mean understanding. The latter may tell us what is the spirit of the community, inform us as to the course of conduct usually followed, and

a number of inherited beliefs and habits. Conscience is unerring. If we labor to enlighten and instruct the conscience we regard it as teachable and hence inferior to understanding. Nevertheless men may be equally sure and sincere when adopting contrary views. The very fact that the wrong can finally be recognized proves the existence of a final authority, namely, the moral law whereby all things are to be judged. While there are differences of opinion on morals there is a surprising amount of agreement and accordance, which all recognize. All intuitively know that justice, truth, benevolence, is right, and its opposite is to be execrated. Even wrongdoers acknowledge this. All remember Iago's praise of virtue and reputation in Othello, while he plans his ruin. There is no difference as to principles, as to conscience, but as to their application to particular cases. Rational men frequently adopt contrary courses. This can be explained psychologically. The differences lie in thought and motive. There is much sophistry in reasoning, as causistry in morals. Circumstances often change, making for doubt and difference; then, too, there is uncertainty as to outcome. This self-regarding feeling often leads to selfishness and evil. Malice is explainable, sometimes unexplainable.

Each must settle his own conscience as best he can, but as a moral problem, not as determined by selfishness, cowardice, self-deceit, enmity or hypocrisy—to mention but a few of the cloud of evil motives that may settle on the spirit. No one will condemn the one who tries to abide by the right from other than personal motives, but from a sense of duty. Mistakes may happen, but if from a sense of duty, men will pardon and pity the mistaken one. We know not the ultimate reason for this struggle in the realization of the moral ideal, but it has its place in our daily life.

Fallacious reasoning plays a great part, so that what may be wrong for one person seems right for another, each apparently following the dictates of conscience. One may accept mere opinions prevailing at the time, and set

up false generalizations in the place of the moral law. It is easy to act in a certain way once custom has established the practice. Acquiescence is thus made easy by authority.

The only ultimate test of moral certainty is the rational basis on which a specific act of conduct rests. How many crimes have been committed in thy name, O Conscience! Monstrous crimes of revenge appear as virtues among savages. Even war among the civilized nations is a crime if reasonable arbitration is not resorted to. It has taken centuries for the nations to find out this elementary law. Even gross immorality has been regarded with honor by some peoples of old. The rational basis in many cases is without foundation. Somehow, somewhere the moral law is being violated, and a hidden sense of unfitness may make itself heard though faintly, if not a sense of shame or remorse. Thus the philosophical doctrine of an unerring conscience is confirmed through the ages, though this does not imply infallibility of judgment in morals. A false judgment may gather moral sentiments around it. There comes a time when the truth comes to light; moments of faith and illumination "which," as Emerson says, "constrain us to ascribe more reality to them than to all other experiences.....the supreme critic of all the errors of the present, and the only prophet of all which must be."

It has frequently been asked, "Is deception ever justifiable?" A great many elements enter into this judgment. Would any of us ever like to be deceived? Perhaps. But we do not thereby declare that it is right to lie. There may be a conflict between the duty to truth telling, and the duty to exercise some contrary "and opposed form of virtue." This the individual himself must decide on the highest grounds, on grounds of duty, with the mind kept fixedly on the highest moral ideal, else in deciding the case either way the moral ideal has been violated through a duty unperformed. On examining such apparently conflicting claims of duty, we find that there is really no conflict, if the case is brought up to the high-

est tribunal. It is not always safe, as Shakespeare says, to be direct and honest; rather say nothing at all, if the truth is really unkind. A falsehood or deceit may be a kindness to a person but a wrong to society. One furthermore may not be obliged to a course of kindness. A great many considerations enter into this matter of common dispute; a code of laws would have to be drawn up if every instance is to be classified. But like a peak sun-smitten above the clouds, truth will have its final claim.

We all admire with Aristotle the plain dealer honest both in life and speech. Some have the audacity to say that there is really no cardinal virtue of truthfulness, for its own sake. Indeed this virtue may be the very core of character, the indispensable element of morality, as necessary in the field of ethics as exactness is to science. All admit with the ancient philosophers that falsehood is base and censurable while the truth is noble and laudable. Even the savages recognize this as a virtue, ignorant, wicked and crafty though they are, if this virtue is found in a man of power and prudence, who can habitually avoid the safety of resource in deceit. Truth can only be spoken by a strong man or a fool, according to these people, and the career of falsehood must be brief. The history of lying, and the esteem in which it is held by various races, would be an interesting commentary on innate respect for the Moral Law. It requires courage to tell the truth, especially among peoples of the East, where deceit has been reduced to a science, and cheating a fine art. It is not necessary that real truth be known in order to assert this virtue, but simply that what seems truth be stated. The spirit of trueness need not keep us awake at nights, if we are to seek after truths too deep for human industry, and it is right to say that the game may not be worth the candle. We need not exploit barren theory and hair splitting facts in order to practice this virtue. On this point the highest Christian ethics must be liberal. Scientific exactness need not be worshipped, as a form of truth in practical life, else the task will become unreasonably difficult. Still carelessness must be avoided in form-

ing judgments, as well as dogmatism and partizanship. Especially is untrueness a vice when it deliberately disregards the value of truth, nay a repulsive vice, indifferent to the highest good. Such are immoral men at war with mankind and God.

Frivolity undermines all morality and permits no thought or pure feeling to germinate, says Humboldt. In a frivolous soul nothing can emanate from principle, and sacrifice and self-conquest are out of the question. Even so if a frivolous respect for truth bring about a misuse of the powers of judgment in the interests of good conduct.

While trueness is an unqualified virtue, several questions are raised. All the virtues are essentially forms of self in their highest expression. Still truthfulness must be qualified by the other virtues, such as kindness and prudence, and even concealment may be a virtue, or a contemptible vice, as the case may be. Tact must decide in the hands of a good person. Mistakes of speech are likely to happen, often enough, and we may be misinterpreted. There are cases when it is unwise to speak or to remain silent, to do or not to do. There may be occasions when a decent life lived in an indecent environment need be concealed for fear of misunderstanding. It is claimed that one may tell a lie in the interests of kindness. If however, the teller of falsehood is seeking for his own interests, there will be few moralists willing to defend him. But it has been found that the man who has a reputation for truth is treated accordingly, and on this fact our entire financial system is founded.

After all the proofs of virtue and religion are given it should be observed that moral ideas may be warped by ignorance and prejudice. These proofs have been general. Just as reason and speculation may be prejudiced, thwarted and deceived, so the moral understanding may be perverted and actually injured. Its dictates may cry out in vain. Nothing is proved against the reality of our speculative or practical faculties of perception. They are intended by nature to perform and inform us correctly, instruct us how to behave, and what to expect in

consequence of our behavior. Our liability to prejudice is a constant warning to us to be on guard, when important matters of conduct are under determination; to consider nothing as outweighing righteousness—neither custom nor fashion, slight notions of honor, false imagination of present ease, use and convenience to mankind, as one stern moralist has said. This system of relations to truth is not of one's own making, nor often as one wants it. It is for us to recognize its presence, to fit ourselves to it, as part of the order of things. In every declaration of truth as every right act, one becomes or recognizes a system of relations larger than one's self, and acknowledges that the Lord's will be done. All must recognize this larger sphere as something greater and larger than one's own to which we must address ourselves, obeying it in every act or word affirming righteousness.

Every falsehood or wrong act, so warped by ignorance or prejudice is an attempt to deny that there is any system of relations larger and worthier than self, individually. The attempt of wrong to deny this is not altogether successful, since in the early stages the violated order presents its claims in a sense of remorse, condemnation and shame, which it is difficult to suppress, but which persisted in is stifled finally in a hardened heart. Thus is a man shut up in his own claims who has lost the idea of God, and set up instead a magnified image of his own cruelty.

In order to be as far as possible from prejudice, every man should be fully persuaded in his own mind and obey his conscience. While conscience is far from infallible it must be obeyed. In many men it is a curious organ, to be sure. Whatever seems to be right, though he be mistaken, is to be done, though a broader knowledge may change his view of truth. Loyalty to this notion is demanded, no matter what others may think, or whether social custom disapprove, as I have said before. Heroes have braved the disapproval of all society because they recognized their duty to it, and nothing moved them from their convictions of right, nay, nothing in heaven or

earth. It was their own conscience, not any body else's. It is only when they insist on imposing it on others that he may be assuming a knowledge which he does not possess. He must not fall into the pharisaic uncharity of assuming that those who differ from him are morally unfaithful. It must be remembered that many a question of doctrine cannot be settled by such a short method of persecution.

Many a change of opinion is effected only by trial and experience, not by force of exhortation, and no one should dream of trying to alter another's conscientious scruples by means of a syllogism or two, by browbeating or impatient denunciation. A man has a right to his own opinion, and if he is argued with in order to remove his prejudice, that should be tried in a reasonable, judicious spirit. Many an opinion is based on defective knowledge, from one-sided sympathy or from partial reflection. Every one should be fully persuaded in his own mind in order to stand on sound ground, and hence he should be treated in the spirit of charity, though he be prejudiced.

Ignorance and prejudice are not hence so blamable morally as is apt to be attributed. In moral conduct this ignorance may be due to a lack of sensitiveness in moral feeling; or failure to appreciate the motives of men generally, and of those composing one's social environment, or a want of experience or wrong kind of experience as to the consequences of different kinds of conduct, or finally actual dullness or inability for ratiocination or skill in drawing inferences. There are scores of ways in which prejudice and ignorance have been nurtured to a wrong course of conduct.

Such a thing as the right is the one category or general notion or rightness, or conscience, to be contrasted with the understanding or the several faculties which originate our human judgments, and moral conceptions. There are an immense number of ethical judgments passed by all men. Certain forms of conduct are habitually followed by the feelings of approbation or merit, and constitute them as right or wrong. The many judg-

ments, the result of understanding, are judgments of the individual's experience, are discrete and separate, are indeed the results of conscious processes, added to ingrained experience. Sometimes, however, judgments cannot be intuitively pronounced, but come at the end of an elaborate process of reasoning. Without intellectual development on the part of the individual, there could not develop any system of morals, any ethical theory or real morality. One wants to know the reason why, at all times, and it is the questioning of the understanding that often improves morality.

Motive passes over into conduct only through the exercise of intelligence. Choice and deed are effected by it. Conscience is the voice of will, the law of self. Motive alone does not determine action, nor judgment or deliberate choice. It is the total self which acts through conscience, intellect, feeling and will, at the back of understanding, which is a living unity. It has been said that a virtuous understanding is necessary to a virtuous man, and good intentions alone are not the moral life. Moral feeling and judgment, choice and will, are always subject to criticism and review by the understanding, initiated by conscience. There is a stage when the philosophy and science of conduct become a distinct subject of reflection.

Right is formal, while good is substantial. The kernel of faith must be cast into the warm rich soil of an earnest moral life. To give too much respect to the understanding would be the worship of reason. The growing soul must look more for a loving devotion to what is good, than into a conscientious examination into what is right.

Intellection plays a large part in man's moral life. There must exist a certain cultivation of the judgment, if there is to be decided any question of right or wrong. In fact we assume that when the moral character has been richly cultivated, there is a relatively high degree of intellectual culture. He who is capable of idealization can comport himself nobly. In order to have ideals power of thought must be developed. One must be able to grow in wisdom as well as in experience.

Reasoning or understanding is the power to recognize self-evident truth after a process of thinking. This cognition on first principles is distinguished by its intellectual character, not ethical. While it is knowledge of a truth, it is not in any proper sense right action. The formula, act from a maxim at all times fit for the universal, is not derived from the understanding, even though insight into absolute truth, appearing with the unfolding of intelligence itself, is a necessary function of mind. Understanding is not a phase of activity which illustrates personal responsibility but it is necessary and prerequisite to responsible conduct. Even as axioms of mathematics or of deduction are serviceable to the understanding, the moral axiom expressed by the philosopher may be put to use in all our conduct. The two worlds, the ethical and the intellectual are distinct, but somehow connected.

The Socratic doctrine that no man is knowingly vicious is capable of dispute. There are large numbers of unfortunate instances where errors are wilfully persisted in. Still greater are the number who are subject to disorders of moral judgments, and act from mistaken principles. This, as has been said before, does not diminish the authority of the conscience. There can really be no error of conscience, if but reasonableness prevail; and a proper sense of tact. More justly may the blame be put on the reason and the judgment. According to Hutcheson, moral judgments do not themselves possess moral quality, as right and wrong, but intellectual quality, as true or false, correct. How much error are these then likely to fall into, if so many mistaken ideas of the world have been shaped by ignorance. The fact that a thousand confused notions prevail in the uneducated, does not the less take from the operation of conscience within them. But too often it is a source of misconduct and guilt, in accordance with misinformation and false belief. It is only through fallibility that certainty in intellect and morals is discovered after all. Nevertheless conscience cannot be educated; it exists of itself or it does not, to a very noticeable extent, whereas the conscience in presenting

the self-evident truth, unlike the understanding, is unerring.

Ever since the Greeks began their investigations, it was known that the same general truths are common to all men, and the disputes arose from the application of them to particular cases. Feeling peculiar to self plays a great part in influencing conduct. Dispositions differ. Cherished inclinations greatly shelter false generalizations usurping the moral law. What a man inclines to do he generally forces himself to think right.

Superior to prejudice rises moral obligation in its grandeur. Wisdom may choose it at all times, cherishing it, obeying it. Such a love of its dictates rises above fortune. "His blessedness," says Spinoza, "is not the reward of his virtue, but his virtue itself. He rejoices therein, not because he controls his passions; contrariwise, finite things have no power over him." Duty is warred against not only by the forces inimical to prudence, but occasionally by prudence itself. It obliges us in our search for happiness not to infringe on the happiness of others. How far we should make contributions in a positive way to the happiness of our fellows is less definitely settled, but this is none the less an obligation in those who have the ability. Christian duty is sometimes superior to prudence, and points the way to general amelioration.

It may well be fairly doubted whether the most enlightened prudence would be enough of itself to maintain social obedience. At all events, self-love will do little or nothing to improve the condition of society. To the pure self-seeker posterity weighs as nothing. Nor would self-love easily allow of that temporary expenditure that is repayed by the affection of others. A certain amount of generosity is necessary to reap this kind of gratification.

In the average man there is a mixture of the prudential and the sympathetic. I do not now speak of the man of highest character. Both elements are present, but neither very powerful. Many are to be found prudential

in the extreme with little sympathy. The ordinary man has only a moderate share of both. The performance of moral obligation is secured in part by the self-regarding motives, and in part by the sympathetic or generous impulse, which prompt a certain amount of abstinence from injury and self-sacrifice. Still, how neutral a portrait of the perfect man is this. Moral perfection becomes the more admirable by the contrast of the active Christian with the average self-seeking citizen. Kant describes duty as the necessity of an act, out of reverence for law. Moral law is universal and must be abiding. Subjective hindrances such as prudence must disappear in the perfect nature, even when the doing of it ceases to become a pleasure, if we justly regard the harmony of human nature.

The categorical call of duty cannot be negative. Not thou shalt not, but thou shalt, is both a call against evil doing, and an incentive to righteousness. Were a code of ethical law to be drawn up it would necessarily be negative, even though the subjective principles were "not unfit to be elevated into the rank of law in a system of universal moral legislation," as the great German says. Such positive obedience to the moral law or to duty, is not as commonly expressed, irksome. This sense of restraint is due to a failure to adjust our knowledge of law with our disposition to act upon it, and is really unreasonable as anything can be. Thought and impulse should go hand in hand, otherwise we should go astray, without a guiding principle in life except obedience to them. In obeying this law do we find happiness, the truest happiness, not the temporary satisfactions of sense, that turn out in the long run to be against the grain, if exclusively pursued.

In asking whether conscience is altogether the result of a belief in God we need not posit a reasoned belief in a supreme Power. On reflection we find ethical facts of such supreme importance to the race, that we have to assume the synthetic power of a Divine Will. In looking over the field of history and human existence in its evolution we see a divine plan working itself rationally, com-

pletely. Metaphysics then finds the origin of moral laws in the will of God, even though man creates his own standards. We are moments in the self-realization of the Infinite, but not lost to Him. Man is his own law-giver in the moral sphere, as he cannot be in the physical or intellectual realm. Mind is subject to its limitations, as the body is bounded by its environment, but as to the moral law in its operation, man is at liberty to obey it without being under strict compulsion. Nature thwarts and punishes. But man is superior to the sum total of the cosmic process. There is a growing schism between the moral world and the physical, and it is crossed by the conception of God, though the progress of human knowledge can be nothing more than relative approximation towards a full knowledge of the Divine.

Religion does offer much assistance in resolving the contradictions of ethics. It offers the most inspiring attitude towards the problems of morality and existence, in a practical life. All duties become due to the highest and ideally perfect Person, and to men and His children as the sons of God. All doing right is interpretable as loyalty to the will of God, and as being true to the Son of God. To do right in the sight of an impersonal and unattainable ideal is well nigh impossible. In order to give this view a rational basis, we must identify the ground of morality with the world-ground, or order of nature, looking upon the Creator as the source of the moral law, with the full knowledge of the ultimate realization of the moral ideal in the Kingdom of Heaven. Only a conception such as this can give any direction to life, can sum up all knowledge, all faith, all hope.

The problem of conscience is answered by the New Testament. In Christ the purpose and being of God are incarnated, and in Him is the revelation of the personal life of the Eternal. Nowhere else is there sure footing for an authoritative social conscience than in the conception and the revelation of the fundamental life as a self-communicating good. The principle of individuality is a plausible one. The thought of judgment hangs upon

some creative goodness. Were He to remain just a metaphysical absolute, He would remain prisoned in His own infinity. Something nearer to common life, quickening and touching it, is necessary to give it coherence. There is no final reason why we should become sanctified, unless God somehow reveals Himself as a creator. Human feeling about the nature of the good is clarified by the conception of the Christ. Incarnate in Him, the goodness of God proves itself as altogether personal and outgoing, creative and redemptive, in whose purpose dwells and energizes the will of the Absolute, in whose perfect person nothing is incoherence and waste.

It was Jesus alone who felt and saw and knew that this comprehensive source and environment of nature and of man, cannot be itself less than personal,—so he gave to it the personal name of Father, and revealed to mankind that the doing of the Father's will to all our fellowmen, His children, is the open secret of the blessed life. The Christian life is based upon devout acceptance of the will of the Father and the universal good which it includes, as the very principle and substance of one's own thought and action. This is an essential element in our Christian faith, and covers our whole life, guiding us in the many perplexing facts of conduct which confront us daily, as well as figuring in the upward progress of society, and the evolution of the entire world-ground.

The net result of theological thought is that while God in His absolute existence must remain to us a fathomless mystery, we come nearest to the truth when we think of the Father, the Son and the Spirit. Jesus took upon Him the laws and limitations of the human lot and thus became man in order that He might lift us to God. Through Him we learn that we are children of God, and that we are to live this life with the consciousness that the spiritual world is one with goodness as its aim. This oneness and goodness has its parallel in the reason and righteousness that struggle for expression in our own moral and spiritual life.

Were human development normal there would be no need of conversion. But man is endowed with that miraculous element of freedom and individuality. And what is spiritual freedom? In the ultimate analysis, and in its truest application, it is freedom from sin. This is hardly to be looked upon in a negative sense. Spiritual freedom as the crowning glory of spirit involves reason and conscience which have become interrelated, which is free through its own energy, through devotion to the truth, through resisting and thwarting temptation. The essence of spiritual freedom is power, power to do right as power to avoid error when the lower forces of our being beckon on. God creates and puts forth the facts of the spiritual order. It is God's end to make us free, and He can only work through our freedom. To appreciate the divine order we must open our minds to the Word of God. It is through faith alone that we can see the inspiration which guides the rational life, else we should be free to follow the dictates of sense and convenience alone. Divine grace and help are needed by all and by all alike. The ought-to-be, authoritative, imperious ought-to-be, stares us in the face and condemns the is. Otherwise man is not subject to the dictates of fate, but works out his salvation under divine guidance.

More and more in the course of the long experimental period of man's trial it has been made plain that true faith far from being in hostility to freedom, cannot survive without it. There can be no genuine freedom without faith. God's blessedness is not in having everything settled beforehand, but in the feeling of His eternity, and the final security of his purpose. If mankind found themselves from birth to death in a settled state of security and happiness without any solicitude or thought of their own, being in no danger of being brought into inconvenience and distress by carelessness, or the folly of passion, through bad example, the treachery of others, or the deceitful appearance of things, we should not by any means look to our future interests, as all would be in the hands of a mechanical God. Our present existence can in no

wise be proved to be inconsistent with the perfect moral government of a most wise Governor.

Much has been accomplished by the ethics promulgated by Jesus. It has transformed the moral world, and changed the face of civilization. His morality is the highest expression of the moral law. But this perfect order of morality issues from a personality distinguished by divine tact. He taught mankind to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world in expectation of the future judgment of God. He confirmed the truth of this moral system of nature, and He set us a perfect example that we should follow His steps. The transcendent power of His personality lies in His absolute sinlessness, as by His devotion to an active, working sense of the right. He has furnished us with a perfect ideal, and those who strive in a measure toward His sublimest virtues have always said that what they have done they have accomplished solely by the aid of His grace and solely by the imitation of His example.

His teaching is marked by a tone of absolute authority. "Ye have heard what I said,—what I say unto you." This centered in the two great truths of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and from the latter has sprung every application of morals. The supremacy of the spiritual law is always enforced by His personality. In the teachings of Jesus is to be found the infallible rule for right action, the true standard of weight and measure for every thought and action of man.

Christ Jesus saw in every human being a mind which might wear His own brightest glory. His utterances always praise the best in human nature and express in the form of parables true comfort for the devout. The moral life is elevated by Him above all external formulas and precepts in the very spirit of the moral law, so that each personality is fed with the strength which is of Him. The perfect ideal in all its fullness is to be realized by all. He does not lay down the law in precise and set terms. It does not exist in striking individual sayings to be memorized. The spirit that fills all the teachings with a living

power is new and great, though it is simple. His character daily contemplated becomes a source of overflowing joy and gratitude, and creates a gentle and peaceable disposition. It creates freedom from perplexity, firmness in the right, insight into the best that is in life.

St. Paul says in effect that every human being is bound by the moral law of his nature, a law written in his heart, and is bound to obey the dictates of the small still voice within, which speaks to him and enables him to judge with more or less certainty between right and wrong. And it becomes a thousand fold true when it is applied to Christians, who cannot plead ignorance, and cannot say that they do not know what the law of God is, and what it demands.

Conscience is that part of man's nature which not only enables, but to a certain extent compels him to judge what is right and wrong. It is that principle within him which approves or disapproves, not only of his own thoughts, words and actions, but of the sentiments and conduct of other men. It operates as well with reference to the past and future as to the present. It cognizes not only individual man, but human nature. It pronounces concerning actions as right or wrong, not merely with reference to one person, at one time or place, but absolutely or universally. Such briefly expressed is *conscience*, in the amplest sense of the term.

All without reference to creed have the light within, feeble and flickering perhaps, but sufficient in any instance to keep from entire darkness. They have the moral faculty which bears witness in cases where right and wrong are in question, and which condemns them when they have gone against this light within, and justifies them when their thoughts, words, and actions have been in accordance with it. Though the punishment of its transgression when the conscience is blunted, is not directly severe, there is a balance or compensatory effect, which operates on the soul of the transgressor. Christians learn what are the laws which bind the conscience. Though supreme for each individual, conscience is by no

means an infallible, unerring guide, and its decisions may be reviewed. For spiritual life and advancement it is essential continually to strive as the great apostle to the Gentiles did, "to have always a conscience void of offense toward God, and toward men"; and also that with all their efforts, and all their care, they may, through ignorance and error, transgress the laws of God, and under the plea of conscience, do many things in violation of right.

Take for instance the case of a man who chooses or is persuaded to give himself up, body and soul, to the guidance and use of another man, though in so doing he must if need be stifle every whisper of conscience. He must become a member of a religious or political society whose head he binds himself to obey instantly, blindly, and without question for a moment. No matter what the command may be, no matter if it be even an infamous command, he pledges himself to yield instant obedience, to do whatever is ordered, no matter what it be. Then another instance is the man, who in self sufficiency sets up what he calls conscience, as if it were impossible ever to be in the wrong, and as if able to justify whatever he may fancy to say or do. He has no rule for his guidance but what he pleases; the only law he cares for is such as he sees fit to approve, and he makes the plea of conscience as sufficient to authorize the shocking outrages of the day upon decency and propriety, or the violation of the plainest commandments. Such are extreme cases, in the one in which it is utterly strangled, and in the other elevated into the supreme judge from whose decisions there is no appeal.

Most persons are satisfied to go on through life without much if any trouble on the score of conscience, and with at times a feeling of self-approbation. They are satisfied with gliding along in the current. They may not be guilty of gross vices, and even possess good instincts. They may manifest a commendable spirit of charity and are largely interested in progress. But though God has given them a conscience it does not seem

much to concern them. They do not take care to inform themselves of its obligations, and are ignorant of the laws which bind, control, and guide conscience aright, as written in the Sacred Scriptures. This is however no excuse for men in general, and they can find no answer for culpable ignorance and wilful neglect, when they stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. Others on the other hand honestly and sincerely desire to have the obligations of conscience conform to the will of God; will embrace everything just, right and true, but they are aware that the Bible does not go into details. The great principles of action are expressed in letters of living light, as in the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, and elsewhere. In the application of these principles, however, to the thousand instances which occur in daily life, where men must decide for themselves what is right and wrong, in this application is to be found one of the difficulties of the Christian's state of mind. Good men differ as to what they ought to do or are allowed to do, in the many cases which come before them for settlement and action. And these differences extend to the most absurd cases, and are too many and palpable to mention. These many instances seem to prove that conscience is by no means an infallible, absolutely safe guide. Conscience is no such light to prove sufficient in all cases, being liable to error and perversion. Conscience can be, as it has been in every age, made the plea for fanaticism, persecution, cruelty, crime and outrage. Then, too, a man may have a consciousness of obligation, and desire sincerely to act in accordance with it. Through ignorance of the way in which he is to discharge such obligation, he may do something wrong, while his motive is good. This fact is taken into account by every judge on the bench, and is a positive common law principle. In fact the oath has value only as stamping the belief of the one who swears. He may swear to what is wrong, and yet be held guiltless of perjury, the law holding him only to accountability for his belief. On the other hand, curiously enough, a man may swear to what is right, and ab-

solutely true, though he thought in his own heart the facts were wrong and false; and this oath will constitute perjury, because he swore contrary to his belief, even though the facts were true. It seems then that intention and motive, which is a prime moral quality, may carry the doer into wrong. How much needed then is light on the path; that clear judgment and sharpened mind which will weigh consequences with tact.

Prof. Ladd rebukes the Christian whose conscience is cultivated to so fine a point, that action and positive decision become extremely difficult even on trivial occasions. Conscience is meant for service and guidance rather than for constant self-examination, hesitancy, and acute sensitiveness. A hearty, reasonable energy, sound in its tolerance, which seizes upon actions with healthy aggression and unfailing tact, is more fitted for life's needs. Moral tact will save many useless qualms and embarrassments and delays. Moral tact is the result of experience and much seeing of the world and society, joined to a disciplined mind and character. It is not triflingly scrupulous of every word, or of hurting the feelings of a neighbor just a shade, or of entering into relations which are new and hence likely to be not so carefully squared to it as the more familiar relations. Moral tact does not have to think hard; it sees without an obscuring medium of fog. It goes ahead, and trusts to find the right, if experience makes for hesitancy. It is evident that a conscience well trained will utter itself with greater promptness, and energy, and precision, than one that is not.

How is conscience *a priori*, a portion of man's nature not acquired through experience, a direct gift of God which is born with the soul, directly related to the divine nature, independent of experience, of time and condition, a pure ray from the Infinite, like the soul coming from God (which is its home) amid trailing clouds of glory,—partaking of His benign attributes? This faith and hope and secret knowledge, and certainty that what we do has something ultimate about it; that right and fitness, which distinct from our personality lies back of reason and will,

leads us to a condition of freedom and self-determination in the light of all-comprehending wisdom, such as we meditate of God. Moral certainty accompanies the highest freedom, and is entirely opposite from blind fate. Reasonality and freedom, such as we may consider the acts of God, are balanced qualities. Rationality is bound to no law except the law of its own nature, and hence cannot be properly said to be fated to obey its own nature, since mechanism is not involved.

Of the moral quality which conscience presupposes, our notions are as simple as the perception of space and time. Human relations and acts are the content of morality, but they are not the moral consciousness or conscience itself. This knowledge is primitive, first hand, and intuitive. It is an immediate knowledge by the spirit of the quality of its own states. Without such perception, morality would be like an eye without light. This is doubtless the highest possible stage of being. For it everything else was made. Nothing conditions the spirit above the conscience. It is the good seeing the supreme good of man, and is hence limited by nothing outside it. Everything subordinate and nothing superior to conscience, proclaim it to be a most wonderful force in the universe. The human constitution itself speaks for the wondrous moral law that was proclaimed on Sinai four thousand years ago, and two thousand years ago on the Mount. Deep calleth unto deep.

Rockwood, Pa.

ARTICLE V.

THE LITURGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY REV. R. MORRIS SMITH, PH.D., D.D.

(Continued from October No. 1917.)

THE PROVISIONAL LITURGY OF 1864.

At the meeting of the General Synod in 1864, at York, Pa., the "Rev. Dr. S. S. Schmucker, from the Committee on the Liturgy, presented printed copies of the Liturgy, as prepared by the Committee, which were on motion distributed among the members of the Convention."

Dr. Schmucker presented the report of the Committee on the Liturgy. This report is entirely too lengthy to be embodied here in full. Only the salient points are therefore given. The Committee met soon after their appointment at Lancaster, Pa., in 1862, effected an organization, and by a series of resolutions agreed upon the method of procedure. The General Synod's Liturgy was to be the basis upon which the new Liturgy was to be constructed, and other Liturgies in use in different parts of the Church were to be consulted and used. Only *one* form for each *Act* was to be prepared. Wherever difference of doctrinal opinion existed, Scripture passages were to be employed "without comment." In accordance with these principles, a Sub-committee was appointed to prepare the new Liturgy. The Sub-committee consisted of Dr. S. S. Schmucker, Chairman; Dr. S. Sprecher, Dr. H. N. Pohlman, Dr. J. G. Morris, and Dr. G. F. Krotel. The day preceding the meeting of the General Synod at York, Pa., the whole committee was to meet and act on the report of the Sub-committee. The report also specifies in detail the difficulties experienced by the committee and closes

as follows: "We close our report with the remark, that in this Liturgy the system of rubrics was prepared entirely for this book, and is designed, by presenting a large amount of instruction to the ministers, how these exercises shall be conducted, and to the people on the proper mode of attending on them, in order that greater uniformity and activity may be secured in the worship of God. Of the forms themselves, the largest portion is taken from the former Liturgy of the General Synod, the next largest portion from the Pennsylvania Synod's English Liturgy, others from the New York Liturgy, and a few from the forms of Dr. Seiss. In all these forms various improvements have been attempted in the phraseology, many long sentences, which were difficult to be read in public, have been divided and remodeled, into two and sometimes three sentences. On Baptism a new form has been prepared *embodying an argument for pedo-baptism*; on ordination also a similar original addition has been made, and throughout the whole an increase of devotional and practical character has been aimed at."

The fate of this "Provisional Liturgy" is presaged in the following action: "Whereas, so important a measure as the adoption of a new Liturgy for the Church should not be taken, until after the most careful and mature deliberation, therefore, *Resolved*, That the new Liturgy prepared and printed by the Committee be referred to the District Synods and Churches for examination and that a committee of five be appointed to whom the action of the several Synods shall be submitted, which committee shall adjust and, as far as possible, endeavor to harmonize said action; and report the same to the General Synod; and also to make any amendments which their judgment may approve." Committee: S. S. Schmucker, D.D., S. Sprecher, D.D., T. Stork, D.D., H. N. Pohlman, D.D., J. G. Morris, D.D.

At the next meeting of the General Synod held at Ft. Wayne, Ind., in 1866, Dr. S. S. Schmucker again offered the report of the Committee on Liturgy. He again recounted the conditions under which the committee ap-

proached their work, referred to the action of the last meeting of the General Synod in referring the matter to the District Synods for examination, suggestions, &c., and in appointing a committee of five to whom the result of the action of the Synods should be submitted, and concluded his remarks by saying: "We regret to say, that not in a single instance did any such proposed alterations, either verbal or real, reach your committee. We know also that some of the synodical committees gave the work but little attention, especially in regions where a Liturgy is rarely used. Of one thing your committee feel convinced, that unless we build upon the labors of our predecessors, unless we hold fast to this selection, making whatever further amendments may be deemed necessary, many years will elapse before the Church will be at rest on this subject, or have a good Liturgy. The majority of our Synods are decidedly opposed to any increase of liturgic forms, beyond what are contained in this selection; and as this consists of a careful selection of the most approved forms in all the Liturgies in use among us, we do not suppose that any individual could compose an original one better than these or that half as many Churches or Synods would be willing to receive it."

The committee then submitted the following resolutions:

1. "*Resolved*, That the General Synod first hear the reports of the delegates of the different Synods, if they have any to make.
2. "*Resolved*, That the Synod hear the Liturgy read, at least so far as the exercises of public worship on the Lord's Day are concerned.
3. "*Resolved*, That the Synod now give the committee suggestions for the further improvement of the Liturgy, if deemed necessary.
4. "That with these instructions the committee be requested to make such further improvements in the work as they may deem proper.....
6. "The book be styled the Provisional Liturgy, and the ministers be authorized to introduce it for trial in their Churches."

This report "was accepted for further action." Dr. Schmucker's "Provisional Liturgy" was never adopted by the General Synod. The action taken at a later session was as follows:

"Resolved, That the Liturgic Committee be continued, and be enlarged by adding thereto Rev. Drs. Brown, Hay, and Conrad, with instruction to complete the form of Public Worship for the Lord's Day, as soon as convenient, and publish a provisional copy of the same, for the use of the Church."

"Resolved, That the committee improve the Liturgy, and refer it to the next General Synod."

Whether the last resolution refers to the General Synod's old Liturgy, or to the "Provisional Liturgy" is difficult to state. Liturgical matters were in a rather chaotic condition at this period. It was well that the General Synod did not adopt Dr. Schmucker's "Provisional Liturgy." Something better was in store for the General Synod a few years later.

A copy of this "Provisional Liturgy" is before the writer. It embraces 124 pages, and is divided into 16 sections as follows:

Section I. Order of exercises for the Public Worship of the Lord's Day.

Section II. Public Worship of the Lord's Day.

Section III. Ecclesiastical Festivals.

Section IV. Other Festivals. For Days of General Humiliation, Thanksgiving and Prayer, appointed by ecclesiastical or civil authority.

Section V. Baptism.

Section VI. Confirmation.

Section VII. Lord's Supper. (Two forms).

Section VIII. Solemnization of Marriage.

Section IX. Installation of the Church Council.

Section X. Ordination to the Gospel Ministry.

Section XI. Licensure of Candidates.

Section XII. Installation of a Pastor.

Section XIII. Form for the Excommunication of In-corrigeable Sinners.

Section XIV. Laying of a Corner-stone.

Section XV. Consecration of a Church.

Section XVI. Burial of the Dead.

The first section is divided as follows: I. A volunteer Anthem, Chant or other piece by the Choir, if there be any. II. Scriptural Benediction, Salutation or Invocation. III. Reading the Confessional Prayer; with the Lord's Prayer, and either the Creed or the Decalogue. IV. Reading the Scriptures. (Baptism of children, if any). V. Announcement and Reading of the first Hymn. (If the previous exercises were performed at the desk, the minister now ascends the pulpit). VI. Extemporaneous General Prayer. VII. Reading of the second Hymn. VIII. Sermon. IX. Closing Prayer. X. Collection and Notices. XI. Closing Hymn and Doxology. XII. Benediction.

Ample material is provided for these different parts. In the Third Article of the Creed, we note the expression, "the holy, Catholic or universal Church" followed by a "comma."

When the General Synod met at Harrisburg, Pa., in 1868, the subject of the liturgy had evidently become one of considerable annoyance. The Committee of five (5) appointed in 1864, and supplemented in 1866 by the addition of Drs. Brown, Hay, and Conrad, reported "on the form of public service." The report was tabled, and the Committee discharged. But the liturgical question could not be thus easily disposed of; for immediately "a motion was made that a Liturgical Committee of five members be appointed, to prepare a form of worship for Sabbath morning service, and for the Lord's Supper and Baptism, so that the pastors may have it in their hands at an early day." This motion was subsequently amended so as to read: "*Resolved*, That a Committee of three be appointed to revise the Liturgy, and that the President name the members thereof at his convenience." This motion prevailed and the following Committee was appointed: Rev. L. E. Albert, D.D., Rev. T. Stork, D.D., and Rev. J. G. Butler.

THE LITURGY OF 1869.

The labors of this Committee seemed to strike a responsive chord in the hearts of the delegates to the next Convention at Washington, D. C., 1869. Their report, offered by the Rev. Dr. Stork, (so far as Orders of Morning and Evening Worship were concerned), was received, amended on various points, adopted, and ordered published. We have here what is commonly known as the "Washington Service," and still used, with modification, however, in many of our Churches. The following parts constituted this "Order of Morning Service." I. Introit. II. Gloria Patri. II. Confession of Sin ending with the *Kyrie*. IV. Apostles' Creed. V. Gloria in Excelsis. VI. Hymn. VII. Reading of Scriptures. VIII. Prayer. IX. Hymn. X. Sermon. XI. Closing Prayer. (Lord's Prayer). XII. Hymn. XIII. Benediction. The "Introit" of this Service was a series of sentences, selected from different Psalms, rather than a number of verses taken from the same Psalm.

The "Evening Service" contained the following parts: I. Four "Invitatories," each ending with the *Gloria Patri*. II. Hymn. III. Scriptures. IV. Prayer. V. Hymn. VI. Sermon. VII. Lord's Prayer. VIII. Doxology. IX. Hymn. X. Benediction.

That the Committee in arranging the two "orders" above given, depended largely upon the "Provisional Liturgy" of Dr. Schmucker, is plainly evidenced upon a close analysis. However, they made some valuable additions and changes. The additions were the *Gloria Patri* after the opening sentences, the *Kyrie* after Confession of Sin and Prayer, and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, following the Apostles' Creed. The Second Form of "Invitation to Confession" in the "Provisional Liturgy" became the first in this service. The Lord's Prayer, which in the "Provisional Liturgy" formed the conclusion of the Confessional Prayer, was removed to its more logical position,—the conclusion of the Closing Prayer.

The Liturgy of 1869 was the first approximation to

anything resembling a historical Order of Service since the organization of the General Synod. But it was only the beginning. Brighter days were coming. Even the "Morning Service" underwent a gradual evolution and the "Evening Service" was considerably enlarged and improved.

At this Convention of the General Synod it was resolved to prosecute the work of revision, so far as the "Ministerial Acts" were concerned, and the Committee was therefore instructed to "revise the present Liturgy and report at the next meeting."

At Dayton, Ohio, in 1871, the Rev. Dr. L. E. Albert, acting for the Committee reported that the "Committee appointed to revise the Liturgy beg leave to report that they have attended to their duty, and request that Tuesday morning be set apart to listen to the reading of the revision, that they may make a final report to this body." In accordance with this request, the Synod entered upon the consideration of the report "part by part," consuming the time to the hour of adjournment; and when the matter was again taken up at the afternoon session, the subject was disposed of in the following manner:

"Resolved, That the Liturgy compiled by the Committee, and in part adopted by the General Synod, be submitted, when completed, to a Committee to be appointed by the President, and conveniently located, who shall carefully revise the whole work, and endeavor to make the whole harmonious and worthy of our Church.

"Resolved, That the more important forms, especially those for the administration of the ordinances, and those for special occasions, be published in the *Lutheran Observer*, and candid and courteous criticisms invited, and that the Committee delay the final revision until they may have the benefit of such criticisms.

"Resolved, That after due time for criticism and revision, the Committee be authorized to have the Liturgy published for the use of our Churches."

In compliance with the resolution, the following Committee was appointed: Rev. S. Sprecher, D.D., Rev. I.

Magee, Rev. W. M. Hamma, Rev. T. T. Titus, and Rev. J. Swartz, D.D.

The next Convention of the General Synod was held at Canton, Ohio, in June 1873. The Liturgical Committee reported "that according to the instructions given at Dayton, Ohio, they submitted the Liturgy after its completion to the Reference Committee appointed by the General Synod. This Committee after a general revision of the work of the Liturgical Committee concluded that as a whole it was not satisfactory, and recommended that some one be appointed to whom the entire compilation of a liturgy should be entrusted. In accordance with this recommendation, the Liturgical Committee requested Rev. I. Magee, D.D., to undertake this work, which was finally done by him, to the entire satisfaction of both Committees. As the Liturgical Committee have neglected a part of the instructions given by the General Synod, they would respectfully request a renewal of the action at Dayton, Ohio, viz.:

"*Resolved*, That the more important forms, especially those for the administration of the ordinances, and those for special occasions, be published in the *Lutheran Observer*, and candid and courteous criticisms be invited and that the Committee delay the final revision until they may have the benefit of such criticisms.

"*Resolved*, That after due time for criticism and revision, the Committee be authorized to have the Liturgy published for the use of our Churches."

This report was adopted, the Committee continued, and the name of the Rev. I. Magee, D.D., added to the Committee.

In 1875, at Baltimore, Md., the Committee on the Revision of the Liturgy offered their report which was referred back to the Committee for further revision. In 1877, at Carthage, Ill., the Committee reported the destruction of "the manuscript upon which they had spent months of labor," in the office of *The Lutheran Observer*. This necessitated the task of doing the work over again. The work progressed nicely and the MS. was about ready

to be placed in the printer's hands, and might "be expected to appear at an early day." When, however, the Liturgical Committee presented its report at Wooster, Ohio, in 1879, in the shape of a provisional form of a "Book of Prayer," the whole matter was recommitted and "an additional Committee of 7 appointed, who may have six months to offer suggestions and additions" and "on the agreement of two-thirds of the Joint Committee they be authorized to publish the work for the use of the Church." The title "Book of Prayer" in the provisional form evidently did not meet with favor, for it was later "*Resolved*, That the book now compiled by the Liturgical Committee shall be entitled, '*The Liturgy of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*' prepared and published by order of the General Synod."

The joint Committee complied with the instructions given, and, in 1881, at Altoona, Pa., presented their final report, which was adopted and the Committee discharged.

THE COMMON SERVICE.

We now approach a new era in the liturgical development of the General Synod,—an era that, we sincerely believe, made possible the action looking toward THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA. It is the era of THE COMMON SERVICE.

On hundred and thirty-four years ago, the patriarch, Muhlenberg, penned to a friend the following significant words: "It would be a most desirable and advantageous thing if all the Evangelical Lutheran Congregations in the North American States were united with one another, if they all used the same order of service, the same hymn book, and in good and evil days would show an active sympathy and fraternally correspond with one another."¹

With the movement inaugurated for a Common Service, Muhlenberg's wish began to be fulfilled, and the present generation is witnessing more and more such ful-

1 Dr. Mann's "Life of Muhlenberg," pp. 500-501.

fillment. The first step in this most laudable project emanated from the General Synod South, when, at Staunton, Va., in 1876, the following resolution, offered by the Rev. Dr. J. B. Remensnyder, then pastor of a Church in Savannah, Ga., was unanimously adopted: "Resolved, That, with the view to promote uniformity in worship and the strengthening the bonds of unity throughout all of our Churches, the Committee on the Revision of the Book of Worship be instructed to confer with the Evangelical Lutheran General Synod in the United States and with the Evangelical Lutheran General Council in America in regard to the feasibility of adopting but one book, containing the same hymns, the same order of services and liturgic forms, to be used in the public worship of God in all the English-speaking Evangelical Lutheran Churches in the United States." In 1879, the General Council resolved to co-operate "provided the rule which shall decide all questions in its preparation shall be: 'The common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the Sixteenth Century, and, when there is not an entire agreement among them, the consent of the largest number of those of greatest weight.'" In the same year, the General Synod assembled in Wooster, Ohio, "*Resolved*, That the Committee on Liturgy and the Committee appointed to prepare a Hymn and Tune Book, be instructed to correspond with the Liturgical Committee of the General Synod South, and to invite their co-operation in the publication of a Liturgy and a Hymn and Tune Book, with the view that both these general bodies may adopt these books of worship in their Churches."

When the General Synod convened at Altoona, Pa., in 1881, the Liturgical Committee embodied in its report the following: "The Committee was directed to correspond with a similar Committee of the General Synod South, looking to the formation of a Liturgy, that would be suited to the wants of both bodies. Such correspondence has been had. It was, however, found to be too late for practical results, if the work was to be presented at this meeting of the Synod, as was directed to be done."

The meeting of the General Synod in Springfield, Ohio, in 1883, was an important one from the view-point of the Common Service. The Rev. Dr. L. E. Albert, Chairman of the Committee appointed to confer with the Committee of the General Synod South, in reference to the preparation of a "Common Service Book" reported "that owing to a misunderstanding nothing has been accomplished in the direction indicated, and would therefore recommend the continuance of the old Committee, with a new chairman, or the appointment of an entirely new Committee, to act with the General Synod South, in the preparation of such a "Service Book," and report the result of its labors at the next Convention of the General Synod." At this meeting a communication was received from the Rev. E. T. Horn, the delegate from the General Synod South to the General Synod, regretting his inability to be present and conveying fraternal greetings. He enclosed a copy of Minutes of the last Convention of the General Synod South, on pp. 29-30 of which may be found a report on the subject of "a Common Service for all English-speaking Lutherans," declaring its readiness to co-operate on the basis of the "common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the Sixteenth Century." This communication was referred to a Committee whose logical chairman was the Rev. Dr. J. B. Remensnyder, now a member of the General Synod. We are, therefore, not in the least surprised to find the adoption of the following resolution: "*Resolved*, That we hail as one of the most auspicious outlooks of our Church in America, the prospect of securing a Common Service for all English-speaking Lutherans. And that believing such a service to be feasible upon the generic and well-defined basis of the 'common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the Sixteenth Century,' we hereby declare our readiness to labor to this end, and to unite with the General Synod South and General Council in any judicious movement to accomplish it." That the Liturgy adopted in 1881 did not meet with general favor appeared when a petition, signed by fifty-five ministers, was presented, "requesting the appointment of

a Committee to prepare an order of service and liturgical forms more in harmony with the doctrines and usages of the Evangelical Lutheran Church than the Liturgy at present authorized by the General Synod."

To this petition the following answer was returned:

"WHEREAS, This Synod has heard with much interest the petition of fifty-five ministers, expressing their opinion that the liturgy authorized by this body at its last convention does not meet the wants of the Church, and expressing also a desire for a book more in harmony with historic Lutheran books of worship, and enunciating more clearly the doctrines of the Church; and

"WHEREAS, This Synod has already entered into preliminary negotiations with the Southern General Synod, looking to the preparation of a Common Service of worship for all English-speaking Churches; and

"WHEREAS, The present indications are that no order of public worship and forms for ministerial acts would be acceptable to other bodies invited to unite in the preparation of a common service, that would not be conformed to the order and method recognized by the consensus of the standard Lutheran Liturgies of the Church in Europe and America; and

"WHEREAS, This Synod is not aware that any students of the subject in this body have yet outlined, in writing, of appropriate literary excellence, a well-defined ideal of such a book; therefore,

"*Resolved*, That it is not expedient to appoint a committee at this time to prepare a new liturgy.

"*Resolved*, That the Publishing Committee be advised to keep on hand only a limited number of copies of the last Liturgy.

"*Resolved*, That in order to give effect to the project of a common service for all English-speaking Churches, the attention of the District Synods be called to this subject, with a view of eliciting and giving shape to an intelligent sentiment among our brethren.

"*Resolved*, That this Synod hereby suggest to the ministers possessing a liturgic spirit, and gifted with a style

of writing characterized by scholarly excellence, the propriety of a thorough study of the whole liturgical subject, and the outlining of well-matured forms, and their publication in papers or periodicals with a view to aiding ministers and people in forming clearer opinions on the subject, and that the way may be prepared to constitute the future committee to represent this body in a joint committee of all the bodies that may unite in the preparation of a Common Service and Liturgy."

The Committee on "Common Service Book" was constituted as follows: Rev. G. U. Wenner, Rev. C. A. Stork, D.D., Rev. A. C. Wedekind, D.D., Rev. F. W. Conrad, D.D., Rev. M. Valentine, D.D.

No liturgical student, and particularly no student of the "Common Service" can afford to be without a copy of the Minutes of the General Synod, which met at Harrisburg, Pa., in 1885. The reports of the Joint Committee and the General Synod's Committee on the "Common Service" embrace no less than 12 pages of finely printed matter. The report was presented by the Rev. G. U. Wenner. It is difficult to make a selection of material from this report that should enter into an outline as is here attempted. The whole report should be embodied. This, however, is manifestly impossible. Justice to the brethren instrumental in compiling "The Common Service" requires that we here once again name

THE JOINT COMMITTEE.

For the General Synod.—G. U. Wenner, M.A., Chairman; F. W. Conrad, D.D., M. Valentine, D.D., A. C. Wedekind, D.D., E. J. Wolf, D.D.

For the General Synod South.—E. T. Horn, M.A., Chairman; T. W. Dosh, D.D., S. A. Repass, D.D.

For the General Council.—C. W. Schaeffer, D.D., Chairman; John Kohler, M.A., H. E. Jacobs, D.D., S. Laird, M.A., B. M. Schmucker, D.D., J. A. Seiss, D.D., LL.D., A. Spaeth, D.D., C. F. Welden, M.A.

Of this magnificent array of talent, only two are with

us to-day,—Revs. G. U. Wenner, D.D., and H. E. Jacobs, D.D., LL.D., S.T.D.

The Rev. E. J. Wolf, D.D., was appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Rev. C. A. Stork, D.D.

The report contains a "Preface" detailing some facts which have become history. With reference to the basis on which the Joint Committee met and began its labors, we are rightfully informed that "there was no room for the private views and preferences of the members of the Committee, nor were they called upon to *compose* a service which, in their opinion might be adapted to the wants of the times. The more difficult task was set for them, to present in a clear and intelligible form the essential parts of the service as they were universally recognized by the Reformers, and to place upon record the undisputed facts as to what constitutes a Lutheran Order of Service." The report also embodies what the Committee called the

PRELIMINARY PRINCIPLES.

1. That the result of our labors must be referred to the bodies we represent.

2. That we dare make no service binding on the congregation; and that no part of a service should be used any longer than it serves to edification.

3. To furnish the full Lutheran Service with all its provisions for all who wish to use it.

4. That, if at any time or place the use of the full service is not desired, it is in entire conformity with good Lutheran usage to use a simpler Service, in which only the principal parts in their order are contained.

"The Normal Service" is outlined, the various parts explained, many of the sources indicated, rubrical directions noted, and permissive variations stated. "The Order of Morning Service" is given in full, as is also "The Evening Service."

The report of the General Synod's Committee is one of the most readable liturgical documents it has fallen within the pleasure of the writer to peruse. Although a

generation has passed away since first offered, it would be space well utilized, were the greater part of the report reprinted in the QUARTERLY. The necessity of the unbending rule under which the Joint Committee performed its task,—“the common consent of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the Sixteenth Century,”—is justified because of the “widely-divergent sentiments with reference to the purpose, the scope and the constituent parts of the service” in the mind of each member of the Committee, so that if they had not been bound by the rules, each one would “have presented a new, and doubtless excellent liturgy of his own, instead of one old one which embodies the essential features of a service used always, everywhere and by all Lutherans.” This result was attained “not without a painful sacrifice of personal views and prejudices on the part of every” member of the Committee. The correlation and significance of the Service are beautifully introduced in these words: “The Service as here presented is not a mere concatenation of the various parts of public worship without reference to their relation to each other. It represents a historical growth, the roots of which extend far back to the earliest ages, and whose development through the Christian centuries could have been possible only because it served to satisfy the wants of the Christian heart and the worshipping congregation.” The distinguishing feature of the Order is also pointed out in that “it emphasizes the place of public worship in the public service of the sanctuary.” Objections that would in all probability be urged against the service are anticipated and tersely refuted. Our “right of using the liturgy” is splendidly vindicated, reasons adduced for the use of such a Service by Lutherans, and so strongly is the Committee convinced that the normal Lutheran Service is before them in their labors that they do not believe any “Committee can ever be appointed which can possibly bring in a report on the question as to what constitutes the Liturgy of the Lutheran Church that will vary in essential matters from the one which they here present.” Looking back over the liturgical history of

the past, and conscious of the liturgical heritage into which they had come, is it any wonder the Committee closes its report thus:

"After so many years of anxious waiting and effort, the time has come when, forgetting the prejudices of the past, we should make a determined and faithful effort to demonstrate to the world the substantial unity of our Church."

The report was *unanimously* adopted, and in addition, the following resolution, "without a single dissenting voice": "*Resolved*, That the General Synod has learned with great satisfaction that its committee of conference with the committee of the General Council and General Synod South for the arrangement of a Common Order of Service for English-speaking Lutherans, has reached a harmonious and unanimous agreement with those committees; that it approves of the work of the committee, submitted to us, and that the Committee be continued with instructions to finish the details, and also be authorized to publish the completed service for the use of the churches, provided the other two bodies adopt it." It must have been an inspiring moment and the General Synod expressed its feeling when the brethren arose and sang "Praise God from whom all blessings flow," etc., and the President pronounced the Benediction.

At the meeting of the General Synod in Omaha, Nebraska, in 1887, the Committee was able to report its work about completed and ready for publication within a brief time. The report also gives an insight as to the method of carrying out details and states that "The result of all this work is a service which, while it allows considerable liberty of action in its use and admits of variation wherever the *consensus* does not prescribe uniformity, is, in its essential features, the historic service of the Evangelical Lutheran Church." The Committee further states that the question of "Ministerial Acts" had frequently been raised, but authority to co-operate with the other general bodies was not within their scope. The request of the General Council that the Joint Committee

issue "an authorized translation of the Augsburg Confession, and Luther's Small Catechism" is referred to, believing that the General Synod will favorably endorse such a step. Not only was this step endorsed by the General Synod, but it also instructed the Hymn Book Publishing Committee "to publish in all future editions of the Book of Worship and the Book of Worship with Tunes the Order of Service agreed upon by the Joint Committee, and adopted by the three General Bodies." Provision was also made for the publication of the Common Service in "the German and Scandinavian languages."

In 1889, the General Synod met at Allegheny, Pa. The Rev. Dr. M. Valentine presented his resignation as a member of the Common Service Committee. The resignation was accepted. That the Common Service would experience no opposition was an ideal too Utopian to dream of. That the General Synod would loyally stand by it is a matter that reflects its wisdom. Considerable discussion was provoked as to the respective merits of the "Washington Service" and "The Common Service." The matter was finally adjusted by the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the Hymn Book Publishing Committee be instructed to publish in all future editions of the Book of Worship and the Book of Worship with Tunes, the Order of Service authorized in 1869 and subsequently amended, as well as the Order of Service authorized in 1887, the Common Service.

"Resolved, That the Service in use before the adoption of the Common Service shall have equal place with the Common Service, and that this action shall not be construed as being unfriendly to the Common Service." "A memorial from the New York and New Jersey Synod, asking that the Common Service as published by the General Synod in the Book of Worship be changed in the preface, in some rubrical directions, in punctuation of the Creed, and position of the Lord's Prayer in the Communion service, in such way as to correspond exactly with the copy adopted by the Joint Committee" was answered by the adoption of "the recommendation that the Com-

mon Service as printed in the Book of Worship, remain unchanged."

The Committee details the progress of their labors, states that the "copy" for the German Service had been given to the Hymn Book Publishing Committee, deems "the advisability and feasibility of a common form of Ministerial Acts and a common book of worship for the three General Bodies" inexpedient, approves "the recommendation of the General Council concerning inviting all other Lutherans who use the English language, to unite with the three Bodies in the work" of translating the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, notes the death of the Rev. B. M. Schmucker, D.D., a member of the General Council's Committee, and authorizes the publication of the full text of the Commandments in the translation of the Catechism.

The meetings of the General Synod at Lebanon, Pa., in 1891, and at Canton, Ohio, in 1893, furnished very little material in the Committee's report except a statement of the progress made in the translation of the Augsburg Confession and the Small Catechism, and the congratulatory fact that "At the final meeting of the Committee at Wernersville in September 1892, the entire work was revised and completed. At this meeting there were present the representatives of the General Synod, the General Council, the United Synod, the Joint Synod of Ohio, and the English Synod of Missouri. The Norwegian and the Icelandic Synods were also represented by correspondence. All branches of the English-speaking churches of the Lutheran faith were thus represented in the work,—*the first instance of actual co-operation among all the Lutheran bodies using the English tongue.*"

That some of the brethren regarded the Common Service as too lengthy became apparent at Canton, Ohio, in 1893, when the following action was taken on an

ABRIDGED COMMON SERVICE.

"Resolved, That the Common Service Committee be in-

structed to prepare an abridged form of the Common Service for the use of those who may not desire to use the full service, that two active pastors be added to the Committee to assist it in carrying out this instruction, that the abridged service when prepared be printed on leaves that can be laid in our Hymnals or Hymn Books for present use, subject to the action of the General Synod two years hence, it being understood that this action shall in no way affect the present status of either service." The President was directed to appoint the Rev. C. S. Albert, D.D., a member of the Common Service Committee.

At Hagerstown, Md., in 1895, the Committee presented an "Abridged Common Service," prepared by the Committee and having the assistance of the Revs. W. H. Dunbar, D.D., and T. C. Billheimer, D.D., two active pastors. The Committee also reported the progress made on the preparation of "Ministerial Acts." The report of the Committee was adopted after the passage of an amendment stipulating that the Abridged Common Service "be published as heretofore by the Hymn Book Publishing Committee through the Lutheran Publication House in pamphlet form and at a nominal price for the use of such congregations as may desire to use it."

At this meeting the Resolution Committee recommended the adoption of the following: "*Resolved*, That the Common Service Committee be authorized to modify certain rubrics of the service, and to remove or transfer alternate forms of words and music."

Mansfield, Ohio, entertained the General Synod in 1897. Two items only were reported on: Translation of Luther's Catechism and Ministerial Acts. With regard to the former item, "substantial progress toward an acceptable version has been made. But inasmuch as the chief value of such a new translation lies in its being the common possession of English-speaking churches of this country, we recommend that the General Synod request the Joint Committee again to revise its work and to agree upon a final report." Action upon the latter was deferred "for the purpose of obtaining in writing the critical

judgment of all who have given thought and study to the matter, final report to be made at the next meeting of the General Synod."

In the "Report of Committee on Fraternal Co-operation," the fact was noted "That inasmuch as the United Synod has asked the other bodies to unite in the completion of a common Book of Worship and the General Council has endorsed this request:

"Resolved, That this Committee regards the adoption of Common Orders of Ministerial Acts and a common Hymn Book, in addition to the Common Service, as very desirable."

In the light of to-day the following recommendations of this Committee are very significant: "Regarding the overture made by the General Council and the United Synod in the South, looking to the compilation of a common hymn book,

"Resolved, That this Synod regards the proposition with favor, and will do what it can to further the object, consistent with the fact of the issuance of a new Hymn-Book of its own at the present time.

"Resolved, That the General Synod will look with favor upon any movement toward the preparation of Common Orders of Ministerial Acts by and for the bodies in this compact.

"Resolved, That we hereby express our profoundest gratitude to Almighty God for the encouraging measure of success He has accorded these efforts looking to the closer union of the various bodies of our beloved Church, and that we earnestly desire these efforts to be continued, to the end that all who bear the name of Luther may, in the not far distant future, dwell together in the closest fraternal fellowship and love."

The 1899 Convention of the General Synod at York, Pa., brings us a definite report from the Common Service Committee with reference to the "Translation of Luther's Catechism," in which it is stated that "the Joint Committee met, revised its previous work and agreed upon a final report."

The Committee recommended that "this translation be now approved by the General Synod and used in all its future publications of the Small Catechism in English." So far as "Common Acts and Hymn Book" were concerned the Committee could offer nothing definite. "The Liturgical Portion of the Hymn Book" awaited the orders of the Hymn Book Publishing Committee. Forms for Seventeen "Ministerial Acts" were also presented by the Committee and the dissent of some members of the Committee with reference to certain Forms noted. After the authorization of a few changes in several of the Forms, the report was adopted. The Committee received instruction "to include in Ministerial Acts a Form for the dedication of Bells," and to prepare a "Preface" to these Acts.

In 1901, at Des Moines, Iowa, the Committee on Common Service was able definitely to announce the completion of the Ministerial Acts; but definite results had not yet been attained in the preparation of "a common book of Ministerial Acts as well as Hymn Book." However, a substantial unity of spirit and purpose is manifest, and it is the judgment of the Committee that a continuance of this fraternal relation and common work is desirable, since the results, though not to be expected in the immediate future, are full of promise for the interests of our growing Church."

The Committee also recommended that all future English editions of Luther's Small Catechism use the 1899 translation; that "the Hymn Book Publishing Committee publish the German translation of the General Synod Catechism as prepared by the German Catechism Committee; and that an English-German edition be published."

In 1903, at Baltimore, Md., the Common Service Committee embodied in its report the "Statement of the Joint Committee," in which the work accomplished, so far as Ministerial Acts and a Hymnal were concerned, is noted. The manuscript of the Hymn Book was reported completed, but final approval was not asked. The request of

the United Synod in the South to be permitted to publish the Hymnal for its own use was granted. The following resolutions of importance were adopted:

"Resolved, That the Joint Committee of the General Synod, General Council, and United Synod South on One Service Book and Hymnal be requested to print the Common Service in the simplest form, with necessary rubrics, prefaces, etc., thrown as largely as possible into foot-notes, so as not to confuse the worshipper, but to enable the stranger at once to use the service, and to discover its simplicity and beauty as a form for the public worship of God."

"Resolved, That they be requested to enrich the Collects by adding such other Collects as shall increase their variety and enlarge the scope of their adaptedness to the various situations and needs of the Christian life."

In 1905, the Committee had but little to report at Pittsburgh, Pa., except its sense of loss in the death of the Rev. E. J. Wolf, D.D., and a few other matters of minor importance. The Kansas Synod, however, presented the following: "In view of the fact that our Order of Worship for public services is the peer of any similar service extant, we hereby memorialize the General Synod, through our delegates to the next Convention, to unite with other Lutheran bodies that have co-operated in the compiling of the Common Service, in the adoption of a common music also for the Common Service." This was referred to the proper Committee.

In 1907, the General Synod met at Sunbury, Pa. The report of the Common Service Committee informs us that "a common book of Ministerial Acts has been considered by the Committee and the work has made some progress." We are also informed that the United Norwegian Lutheran Church had asked permission to be represented in the Joint Committee as well as to be permitted to print the Common Service, and that the request was submitted to the Committee of each of the General Bodies, and an affirmative answer returned. The adoption of common music for the Common Service had not yet been con-

sidered, and indulgence was begged for a little while longer on the matter of a "simplified service and an enrichment of the Collects."

The following resolution was also referred to the Committee on Common Service: "Resolved, That the Committee on the Common Service be authorized to change the words, 'He descended into the place of departed spirits,' found in the Washington Service, to the historic phrase, 'He descended into hell,' as used in the Common Service in the future editions of the hymnals." The Committee, however, deemed it unadvisable to make any changes in the "Washington Service," and so reported at the Convention held at Richmond, Indiana, in 1909. At this meeting the Committee also presented the changes made in abbreviating and simplifying the rubrics of the Common Service.

At Washington, D. C., in 1911, the Committee on Common Service, had nothing to present to the Synod on the subject of a common Hymnal, except to state that *some* work had been done.

In 1913, at Atchison, Kansas, a similar report was presented, and the fact stated that the matter of the preparation of the Common Hymn Book was in the hands of sub-committees representing the three bodies interested.

The following items from the Committee's report at Akron, Ohio, in 1915, are most pleasing and interesting:

"It affords us great pleasure to report that after some years of labor the Joint Committee has about completed the Common Book for which the churches have been waiting. The Title adopted is:

Common Service Book and Hymnal
of

The Lutheran Church

Authorized by

The General Synod, the General Council and the United
Synod South.

It was resolved to print all editions of the Common Service Book and Hymnal from common plates."

A brief description of the Hymnal is given, informing us that "the music was chosen after a thorough comparative study of all the tunes given in all the metres in 16 standard hymnals of all churches in England, Scotland, Canada and the United States." We are also apprised of the fact that "the work involved in the preparation of the hymnal was very great and justifies the hope that the churches will find it the very best extant." The "Standard Text" from which the General Synod and the General Council had deviated, was restored. The variations, generally of a minor character, are detailed, and permission asked to use the word "Catholic" instead of "Christian" in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, "in order to bring the liturgical usage of our Church into harmony with our time-honored confessional usage."

The following resolutions were recommended by the Committee:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Common Service, in co-operation with the Joint Committee, be hereby authorized to complete and prepare for publication, without further reference to the General Synod, the Common Service Book and Hymnal, and to include in it the Augsburg Confession, Luther's Small Catechism, such Ministerial Acts as may be agreed upon, and such other matter as may be proper.

"Resolved, That the General Synod approves of the word 'Catholic' in place of the word 'Christian' in the Creeds."

The first of these resolutions was adopted, but the second was *not* approved by the Synod.

The 1917 Convention, in Chicago, Ill., will be chronicled in history as one of the most memorable ever held by the General Synod. The Quadri-Centennial anniversary of the Reformation added its weight to the importance of the meeting; but that which will ever characterize the occasion was the action whereby the General Synod, the oldest of the three general bodies, co-operating for many years to attain certain common objects, resolved, when similar action should have been taken by the other gen-

eral bodies, to become a part of *The United Lutheran Church in America*. When this merger shall have been accomplished, the Lutheran Church will command a prestige and assume a position impossible hitherto. I believe it will be readily granted that the resolution adopted at Staunton, Va., in 1876, by the General Synod South (now the United Synod in the South), looking toward a Common Service, will be regarded by future historians as the foundation-stone upon which this glorious superstructure of a united Church has been erected.

The report of the Committee on Common Service is a most gratifying one,—especially pleasing being its positiveness on "*The Common Service Book of the Lutheran Church*."

"This is the title of the new book of worship for which the Church has waited long, and upon which the Joint Committee has spent much pains-taking labor, and which it believes to be a work of uncommon merit in content and form. The Service Book will appear in October and will consequently be a fitting memorial of the Quadri-Centennial of the Reformation." The report also states the various editions in which the work will appear, and their "Contents." The present world-war has created an urgent demand for "the immediate preparation and publication of an Army and Navy edition of the Common Service Book, to contain a small collection of parts of the Service, the Psalms, Prayers, and Hymns, with such additional material as would be suitable." The approval of the General Synod was requested and granted.

The Committee was also "happy to report that the Joint Committee on Common Service has reached unanimity as to the several forms of Ministerial Acts, nearly all of which have been revised, and which will be published in due time."

The Committee likewise submitted the following:

"Resolved, That the Common Service Committee be hereby authorized to compile and prepare and cause to be published, at its discretion, a book of Ministerial Acts, a Manual or Directory for guidance in ecclesiastical mat-

ters, a Manual of Prayers, etc., and also that the Committee be authorized to collaborate as far as possible with the Joint Committee in such publications."

Thus reads the history of the liturgical development of the General Synod. The writer needs not be reminded that a much more orderly and systematic arrangement could have been given the matter set forth in this compilation. By treating the subject topically a readier reference might have been afforded, perhaps, than by viewing it according to the method pursued, but such a treatment would have demanded entirely too much space. Readers can rest assured that practically every resolution ever adopted by the General Synod, bearing on the subject of a Liturgy is embodied within the compass of this article, and expressed in the language of the official Minutes of the General Synod.

Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE VI.

THE COMMON SERVICE BOOK AND HYMNAL.

BY ELSIE SINGMASTER LEWARS.

The Church has waited long for its new Common Service Book and Hymnal. It has waited both with patience and with impatience, at once anxious to possess its treasure and unwilling to hasten the constant and untiring labor of those who for years have given unstintedly their time and effort. Of the amount of labor, of the vexatious delays, of the unforeseen difficulties entailed by so large an undertaking the Church has for the most part only a layman's knowledge, but it is conscious that they must be many.

The three bodies, the General Synod, the General Council and the United Synod in the South, have not been alone in their desire to possess a book representing a higher standard in text and music than their earlier books. During the last ten or fifteen years all Church Bodies in the United States, Canada and England have put forth revised and improved Hymnals. Among the most important are the revised "Hymns, Ancient and Modern," 1904; the English Hymnal, 1909, (the High Church Party in the Anglican Church); Church Praise, 1912, (Hymnal of the Presbyterian Church in England); the Church Hymnary, 1910, (a Common Hymnal for the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, etc.), Worship Song, 1905, edited by W. Garrett Horder, chiefly for Congregational Churches. The Episcopal Church in Canada published in 1910 "The Book of Common Praise." The Presbyterian Church in the United States revised its Hymnal in 1911. The Episcopal Church has completed the revision of its Hymnal, the text of which was reported at the last General Convention, and the music of which is now in preparation.

The new volume which may well rank with the Hymnal of any Church body is in the first place a beautiful one. The gold lettering, the simple binding, the clear monotype printing of the service, the placing of the hymn as a whole below the music and neither altogether nor partly between the staves, all contribute to this effect. The book is substantial, but not unwieldy. Though it contains two hundred pages more than the Book of Worship, it is very little heavier.

The arrangement improves upon that which we have hitherto had. Following directly upon the Table of Contents and the Calendar of the Church Year is placed the Common Service so that it may be quickly and easily found even by the stranger who is unfamiliar with the book. In the Book of Worship it was to be found after diligent search as far back as page 43. In the new book not even the prefaces have been allowed to stand before it.

The rubrics have been greatly simplified. Italics have been omitted in the interest of a clear page, and also because italics are a subordinate form of type, each response being indicated by a modified letter R, used in liturgical printing to indicate Responses. The colons dividing the psalms are plainer than in the old book.

Two settings of the service are given. In each there are only a few alternate forms, the alternate settings of the Gloria Patri, one for use in Lent, the Sentence to be used instead of the Hallelujah in Lent and alternate Offertory sentences. A few alternate forms have been inserted later in the book, but every care has been taken so that the service itself may stand clearly before the eye of the worshipper and be used by him with the greatest comfort and profit.

The first setting has been compiled and edited by the Rev. J. F. Ohl, Mus. Doc. It is based on melodies long associated with the English text of the Liturgy and includes also more modern settings.

The second setting contains the historic Plain Song settings used in the Christian Church for more than a thousand years. The arrangement used is that of Doc-

tor Luther D. Reed and Mr. H. G. Archer. The two settings are entirely separate. By including them both it is intended that a variety of musical taste may be satisfied.

Following the two settings of the Service are the Introits, Collects, Epistles, Graduals and Gospels for the Church Year, and the Invitatories, Antiphons, Responsories and Versicles for Festivals and Seasons, the Collects and Prayers, the General Prayers, the Psalms, the Canticles. Then follows the History of the Passion and two special Orders of Service, one the Preparatory Service, the other the Service for the Burial of the Dead. The General Rubrics and three Prefaces complete the liturgical portion of the volume.

The text of the Liturgy has been altered very slightly, and this by way of improvement.¹ A meaningless sentence concerning enemies has been omitted from the General Prayer and several welcome petitions have been added, for missions, for the ministry of the Word and for our schools and homes. There is also a permissive use of the Gradual, a choir response sung after the Epistle. The liturgical appointments (pages 153-162) provide Lessons Collects, Introits, etc., for all the special Days (Minor Festivals) in the Calendar, including those commemorating Apostles, Evangelists, etc., as well as Reformation, Harvest, Thanksgiving, etc. The number of Psalms has been increased and the full text of the Epistle and Gospel for the Day and the full Passion History are given.

The Augsburg Confession, the Formula of Government and the Constitution of the General Synod have been omitted from this music edition, but Luther's Small Catechism will be printed in the word edition of the book.

There are three prefaces, one originally printed in connection with the Common Service in 1888, explaining the history of the Service and its claim to be "the Common Service of the Christian Church of all ages," and making clear by quotations from the Augsburg Confession the conviction of the Lutheran Church that though "the true

¹ The Exhortation has been omitted from the Communion, to which it does not belong.

unity of the Church is not injured by dissimilar rites" yet that usefulness and tranquility are maintained and edification served by the use of a common historic service. The two shorter prefaces give a brief statement of the principles governing the work of the editors of the new volume.

Except for those of the authors and composers of hymns and music no names appear on the volume. Now that the Common Service has for thirty years served to edify an increasingly large number of our congregations until its use is the rule and not the exception it seems that any account of the new edition would be incomplete without mention of those who prepared it. The committee whose report was gratefully accepted in 1888 consisted of G. U. Wenner, D.D., A. C. Wedekind, D.D., F. W. Conrad, D.D., E. J. Wolf, D.D., and M. Valentine, D.D., of the General Synod, C. W. Schaeffer, D.D., John Kohler, M.A., H. E. Jacobs, D.D., S. Laird, M.A., B. M. Schmucker, D.D., J. A. Seiss, D.D., A. Spaeth, D.D., and C. F. Welden, M.A., of the General Council, and E. T. Horn, M.A., T. W. Dosh, D.D., and S. A. Repass, D.D., of the United Synod in the South. Those who builded upon the foundation thus laid and have given us not only a Common Service beautifully represented but a Common Hymnal are J. A. Singmaster, D.D., D. H. Bauslin, D.D., J. B. Remensnyder, D.D., LL.D., William E. Fischer, D.D., J. A. Clutz, D.D., F. H. Knubel, D.D., E. K. Bell, D.D., G. A. Getty, D.D., of the General Synod; H. E. Jacobs, D.D., LL.D., T. E. Schmauk, D.D., LL.D., J. E. Whitteker, D.D., E. F. Keever, D.D., J. F. Ohl, Mus. Doc., L. D. Reed, D.D., A. L. Steimle, D.D., E. F. Bachman, D.D., C. M. Jacobs, D.D., Rev. J. C. Mattes, Rev. Paul Z. Strodach, Rev. Gomer C. Rees, Rev. F. Jacobson, Ph.D., Rev. M. E. Haberland, Rev. A. J. Reichert, T. E. Benze, D.D., W. L. Hunton, Ph.D., of the General Council, and M. G. G. Scherer, D.D., E. C. Cronk, D.D., and A. G. Voigt, D.D., LL.D., of the United Synod in the South.

Beside these, the members of the committee at the conclusion of its work, a number of others assisted in the

earlier stages but died before it was completed, among them Doctors A. Spaeth, E. T. Horn, Ludwig Holmes, and C. M. Esbjorn. Doctor G. U. Wenner has also been a member of the committee during its whole history, except for two years.

Returning to the plan of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg in the first American Hymnal of 1786, the committee has followed the Church Year in the arrangement of the hymns. Thus the Advent hymns come first. Each hymn is printed as a whole, under the music, but separate from it, so that its poetical form and content may be grasped. This arrangement lifts the church hymnal to a position above that of the elementary singing book or Sunday School book where it is proper that the amateur singer should have all the help possible. It should also remind the pastor or leader that a great hymn is a unified composition and that it cannot have stanzas lopped off at the end or cut out in the middle without injury to the thought.

The omission of the doxologies will probably seem surprising and is to be explained by the fact that they are little used in most Churches, that they are often redundant, that they are very often used simply from custom or as a matter of form when they do not fit the sentiment of the hymn. Bishop Ken's "Praise God from Whom All Blessings Flow" may be found in its original place at the conclusion of both his hymns, Numbers 449 and 471. Many other historic doxologies are also given in connection with the hymns themselves, as in the case of nearly all translations from Latin, and in many original English hymns.

In the appendix have been placed a few tunes which, though favorites, do not belong in a hymnal proper. It is hoped that these may be omitted from later editions.

Added to each section of hymns is a list of hymns of similar character to be found in other sections of the book. These cross references greatly increase the list of suitable hymns for each season or occasion.

A valuable feature of the book is its indexes, which offer to the student of hymnology a quantity of interesting

and valuable material. The Index of First Lines is properly placed last so that it can be most conveniently found, and preceding it are invaluable lists of authors, translators, composers and tunes. It is of the deepest interest to the Church to trace to their source the words and music which have inspired and consoled uncounted generations but it is often impossible owing to the carelessness of some transcriber or editor to find the name of author or composer or the date of the work. The carefully prepared indexes of the Common Service and Hymnal will be used with gratitude by all future Lutheran and many other hymnologists.

In the index of authors and composers may be seen how wide and deep are the sources of the book. It will be of interest to the General Synod to observe that among the modern composers William E. Fischer has contributed the tune *Laus Regis*, Norman W. H. Schafer the tune *Ecclesia*, and Harold Lewars the tunes *Adjutor*, *Salve Jesu*, *Septem Voces*, a seven-fold setting of the words on the Cross, *Vexilla Regis*, *Rorate Coeli* and *Froebel*.

Of the hymns themselves it is difficult to speak in the limits of a book review. Only the finest judgment and the widest acquaintance with the hymns of the ages could have assembled so noble a collection. No hymnal, we believe, surpasses it in quality and serviceableness. We may point to it with pride and we may at the same time make it our daily companion. It is not perfect, but its imperfections are not the fault of its makers. There are great tunes for which no great words exist, there are great hymns which have no adequate tunes. Translations fall often far short of the original and those familiar with the sonorous German of the great chorals feel disappointment when they read them in another tongue. But of these and other difficulties we may say that they have been solved as well as human beings could solve them.

The opening hymn is "O Come, O Come, Emmanuel," a composition of musical and poetical dignity and beauty which since its origin in the eleventh century has expressed in many tongues and in many lands the universal

desire of mankind for ransom for sin and the promise of a Savior. Here, also, in the Advent section, are "Wake, awake for night is flying" and "Oh, how shall I receive Thee," now restored to their proper tunes, "Lift Up Your Heads, Ye Mighty Gates," and "Comfort Ye, Comfort Ye My People," hymns once cherished by all Lutherans but long absent from some of our hymnals.

Beside the best of the Book of Worship's Christmas hymns are many others, both old and new, some of them our neglected possessions, some from non-Lutheran sources. Here are "Good News from Heaven the Angels Bring," by Martin Luther, here "All My Heart This Night Rejoices," and here "Christians, Awake, Salute the Happy Morn." "Joy to the World" is set to a simple beautiful tune within the compass of the average voice and the ability of the average singer. In the Epiphany section "As with Gladness Men of Old" is set properly to Dix.

The Lenten section opens with a lovely setting of "O God, I Love Thee, Not that My Poor Love," and includes the dramatic "Christian, Dost Thou See Them?" set to two fine tunes. "Savior, When in Dust to Thee" has been separated from the light and unsuitable Spanish Chant and set to both Aberystwyth and Wahres Seelenlicht, both expressing its deep and solemn contrition. Similarly "Go to Dark Gethsemane" has been separated from Pilot and adequately set.

In the Easter section there are many hymns long sung elsewhere but little known to our congregations. Among them are "Come Ye Faithful, Raise the Strain," the old and majestic "The Strife is O'er, the Battle Done," and "Welcome, Happy Morning." No hymn is more welcome than that for the communion "Deck Thyself with Joy and Gladness" about the words and air of which is written one of the great cantatas of John Sebastian Bach. "Thine Arm, O Lord, in Days of Old" is set to a stately new tune by Norman W. H. Schafer.

Among the hymns of the Church Triumphant has been placed the treasured "For All the Saints Who from Their Labors Rest," and "Stars of the Morning, so Gloriously

Bright," and among the hymns of prayer, praise and thanksgiving the ancient "The God of Abraham Praise," "Praise to the Lord the Almighty, the King of Creation," and "Praise the Lord of Heaven." "My Hope is Built on Nothing Less," a fine hymn, long joined to poor and difficult music is now set to Melita to which are also set the words of "Eternal Father, Strong to Save" which, with its plea for the safety of those at sea, is now sung over the whole English-speaking world, and which every Sunday in the year is a part of the service at our Naval Academy. "O Morning Star, so Pure, so Bright" is another composition deemed worthy by the world's most famous musician of forming the basis of a great composition. "Jesus, Lover of My Soul" is set to Martin in the appendix, but in the book proper it has much worthier settings in Hollingside and Aberystwth. "My Jesus as Thou Wilt" and "Sweet the Moments, Rich in Blessing," are no longer joined to operatic tunes. "Come My Soul, Thou Must be Waking," has been suitably set to Hayden. The English composers have given us new evening hymns and reset some of those whose words we have long loved.

To the National hymns in the Book of Worship are added "God of Our Fathers" and "God the All Merciful." For safety at sea we have beside "Eternal Father, Strong to Save," "The Ocean Hath no Danger," set to touching St. Christopher. The Resurrection section offers us from the lips and hearts of our ancestors "Jesus Christ, My Sure Defense," and the Judgment section "Great God, What do I See and Hear," and the magnificent and seldom sung "Day of Wrath, that Day of Morning."

The book proper closes with forty-eight hymns for children over which both adult and child may well linger with delight. Here for Christmas are "Silent Night," "Come and Hear the Grand Old Story," "See, Amid the Winter's Snow," "Behold, a Branch is Growing," "Joy Fills Our Inmost Hearts To-day." "Once in Royal David's City," "Oh, Ye Heavens, Bend and See," "There Came a Little Child to Earth." Here for other times and seasons are "Easter Flowers Are Blooming Bright," "God

Spake My Child, God Spake to Thee," "I am Jesus' Little Lamb," "There's a Friend for Little Children."

It is not easy to foresee any extended adverse criticism of the Common Service and Hymnal. There are those in all three bodies who will miss a few hymns, or a few conjunctions of hymns and tunes. There are those who will need to be reminded that for the sake of a growing generation certain favorites of a past poetical and musical taste should be forgotten as soon as possible. But not many faults will be found. The size of the committee, its practical experience with the needs of the congregation, its wide liturgical and musical knowledge, and above all, its long and enthusiastic devotion to noble aims would seem to make it certain that all debatable questions had been considered and had been wisely met.

The Common Service and Hymnal is finished, but it has not yet achieved its purpose and will not achieve it until it has lifted thousands of voices in prayer and praise and thanksgiving. The wide divergence of our liturgical and musical theory and our liturgical and musical practice has often been a source of mortification. Here is the remedy. These hymns are not the easily learned, easily forgotten, worthless compositions of a revival song book; they are the tried and proved support of generations of believers, beautiful in form, rich in content, everlasting. The hymns lose nothing if we do not sing them, they will continue to be sung and to console and uplift long after we have passed on; it is we and our children who will forfeit a heritage if we neglect them. Many of them we have long left indifferently to strangers. Let us now make them our own.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE VII.

THE UNION MOVEMENTS IN THE HISTORY OF
LUTHERANISM,WITH PARTICULAR REGARD TO A UNION BETWEEN LUTHER-
ANS AND REFORMED.

BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.

The term "union," in the history of Lutheranism, has always had special reference to a union between Lutherans and Reformed. However, there have been other union movements in the history of the Lutheran Church. There were the efforts of Rome in the sixteenth century, so persistently prosecuted by Charles V, to reconcile German Protestantism with the Roman Catholic Church.¹ And there is the union movement between the Lutherans themselves, in America, of which we are witnesses at this present time.² These movements stand in absolutely no relation the one to the other. Our theme demands the discussion of only one of these subjects. It may seem as if it would have been especially timely to treat before the American Society of Church History of the inter-Lutheran movement just referred to, but it should not be overlooked that union between the General Synod, the General Council and the United Synod of the South yet awaits final consummation. At this time we shall discuss the union movements between the Lutherans and the Reformed.

A discussion of this subject on the American side of the Atlantic calls for an interpretation of the term "Re-

¹ These efforts began soon after the diet at Worms, reaching their height in the negotiations following the delivery of the Augsburg Confession and in the religious conferences which followed the emperor's victory over the Smalcald Federation, and died in their last weak attempt in the Frankfort Recess (1558), without having accomplished their object.

² The Norwegian and the more English groups of synods each have united or are uniting into large bodies.

formed." We do not mean by it the sisters of the Reformed Church in England and in our own country: the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, nor their daughters, the Methodists, Baptists, Christians, Quakers and so forth; but we mean by that term the German Reformed, as they originated through the early influences of Zwingli upon some of the Southern parts of Germany, particularly upon the so-called *Cities of Upper Germany* with Strasburg, under the guide of Bucer, as their leading factor. Then, further, we understand by the term "Reformed" the followers of Calvin in the Palatinate (since 1559), in Bremen (since 1562), in Anhalt (since 1596), in Brandenburg (since 1613) and in different parts of Germany that cannot be mentioned here. We do not know of union movements of any importance between the Lutherans and the Reformed in France, Holland, and Belgium, but the first of the movements of which we shall treat included an attempt to unite the Reformed of Switzerland with the Church of Luther.

The endeavors at a union between Lutherans and Reformed as they have been in evidence through the centuries can be divided into four distinctive movements. The first of these was undertaken during the lifetime of Luther with Bucer as the chief moving factor, and it culminated in the Wittenberg Concord of 1536. The second general movement comprises the various so-called syncretistic endeavors of the seventeenth century. Then comes, thirdly, the promulgation of the Prussian Union at the beginning of the eighteenth century and the events consequent upon this act. And finally we have on this side of the Atlantic a synodical body (the German Evangelical Synod of America), established with the aim of uniting Lutherans and Reformed into one "Evangelical" Church.

We shall, then, begin with that union movement in the sixteenth century, which, in the nature of the case, was bound to fail in its object. Since only thirty minutes are allowed to finish the discussion at this time the writer shall not aim at more than to complete the first chapter.

But it is his intention, *Deo volente*, to publish also the following three chapters and to dedicate the whole to the American Society of Church History, which has honored him with the invitation to read at this hour.

Note: It might seem that a complete discussion of the union movements between Lutherans and Reformed in the sixteenth century should embrace the events surrounding the Schwabach Articles which were written in July or August, 1529, by the Wittenberg theologians,³ and that it should especially include the history of the Marburg Colloquy. But it will be observed that what we here try to present is not so much an historical account, but chiefly an appreciation on the basis of a history which is presupposed as known. We shall relate only what is characteristic and suggestive of a lesson to be brought out. And interesting as the story of the Marburg Colloquy is in itself, it should not be overlooked that

3 The traditional view has been that Luther, on his way back from Marburg (after Oct. 2nd and 3rd), wrote the Schwabach Articles. It was thought that the more pointed character of these articles, as compared with those of Marburg, is an indication that Luther regretted his very mild statements in the Marburg Articles, and now took occasion to express himself in stronger terms, not only on the Lord's Supper, but also concerning Christology and original sin. See Moeller-Kawerau, *Church History* III, p. 104 (1907); Th. Kolde, in *Hauck's Realencyclopaedie* (R. E.), vol. XVIII, 2. But lately, after a new investigation of documents in the Weimar, Ansbach, Nuremberg, and Marburg archives, Prof. von Schubert of Heidelberg (Germany) has proved that these so-called Schwabach Articles were written at an earlier date. The Wittenberg theologians, Melancthon as the chief author, but Luther co-operating, had drawn up these articles, at the instruction of the Elector of Saxony, as a basis for a union between the Lutherans of the North (Elector of Saxony and Markgrave of Brandenburg) and the Cities of Upper Germany, that had been leaning to Zwingli. They failed in their object at a convention at Schwabach, Oct. 16th, 1529. The South German Cities insisted upon a modification of the statements concerning the Lord's Supper, to which the Lutheran side could not agree "for conscience sake." The reason that these articles remained secret until 1530, when Luther, at Coburg, published them, was because they represented a political document. Prof. von Schubert first communicated the result of his investigations in a lecture, delivered before the "Society for Reformation History" in Cassel, 1908, then discussed it in a very scholarly treatise in the August issue of the "*Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte*" (Gotha, 1908), and soon in a book "*Bekenntnis bildung und Religions-politik*," pp. 280 (Gotha, 1910). Cf article by J. L. Neve in *Lutheran Quarterly* (Gettysburg, Pa.), April 1909.

in the frame of the view over the union movement between Lutherans and Reformed in the sixteenth century *as a whole* it is only preparatory to what was tried out so much more thoroughly and persistently in the Wittenberg Concord of 1536. If ever anybody labored for a union by compromise between Lutherans and Reformed it was Martin Bucer.

CHAPTER I.

THE WITTENBERG CONCORD.

LITERATURE: The works on Church History. We mention: Kurtz, 14th ed. (Leipzig, 1906), revised by Tschackert (p. 136, 8). *Kawerau* in vol. III of Moeller's *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (Tuebingen, 1907), pp. 86ff., 100ff., 124ff. *Koestlin*, *Martin Luther*, 5th ed., revised and completed by *Kawerau*, vol. II, pp. 326-356; 576-583 (Berlin, 1903). The articles on "Wittenberg Concord" in the *Realencyclopaedie* (quoted as R. E.), 3rd ed., vol. XXI, pp. 383ff., by Kolde (cf. Schaff-Herzog); in *Meusel*, *Kirchl. Handlexikon*, 1st ed., VII, pp. 285ff.; in *Lutheran Cyclopedia* p. 545, by Jacobs and Haas, (New York, 1899). *Planck*, *Geschichte des protestantischen Lehrbegriffs*, vol. III, pp. 337-408. *Heppe*, *Die konfessionelle Entwicklung der alt-protestantischen Kirche Deutschlands* (Marburg, 1854), pp. 72ff., 76ff. *Schaff*, *Creeds of Christendom*, 4th ed. (New York, 1899), pp. 525ff. *Seeberg*, *History of Doctrines*, (Philadelphia, 1905), pp. 390ff. (cf. p. 350). *Loofs*, *Dogmengeschichte*, 4th ed. (Halle, 1906), pp. 878, (cf. pp. 862ff.) *Fisher*, *History of Christian Doctrine*, (New York, 1906), p. 290. See also in R. E. the articles on "Bucer" by Gruenberg, (R. E., III, pp. 603ff.), on "Marburg Colloquy" by Kolde (R. E. XII, 248ff.); *Rudelbach*, *Reformation, Luthertum und Union* (Leipzig, 1839), pp. 365-397, and on "Tetrapolitana" by Mueller (XIX, pp. 559ff.) As to original sources, represented largely in the form of monographical publications, containing the correspondence of the

times, see the enumeration in Kolde's article in the *R. E.* (vol. XXI, p. 383f.)

The union movements between Lutherans and Reformed in the sixteenth century cannot be fully understood if we do not keep in mind that on the part of Philip of Hessa and of Bucer as the spokesman of the cities in Southern Germany (especially Strasburg) the political situation was one of the chief motives for all the endeavors that led to the Wittenberg Concord. We may say that these negotiations began in the steps that were taken preparatory to the Marburg Colloquy (October 2nd and 3rd, 1529) and that, therefore, Philip was the father of the whole movement.⁴ His aim, together with Zwingli, was to oppose a strong united front to Charles V and the Roman Catholic princes of Germany. At the time of Marburg and up to the Augsburg Diet in 1530 Philip had been looking to Zuerich as the centre of a contemplated coalition. It was Zwingli's plan to win Philip of Hessa and to isolate Wittenberg (Kawerau, in Moeller's *Church History*, III, p. 104). This plan, Kawerau points out, had practically failed when Philip, at Augsburg (1530), added his signature to the Confession of the Saxons.⁵ The founding of the Smalcald Federation (February 27th, 1530), finally, became the decisive factor that rendered impotent the political plans of Zwingli, which, if they had been successful, would have divided German Protestantism at a very early date.

Political considerations were also shaping the actions of the Lutherans at Augsburg. Zwingli and all that leaned to him were under the ban during the days of Augsburg (1530) for two reasons: (1) because of Zwingli's political plans which made him obnoxious to the emperor; (2) because of his symbolic interpretation of the Lord's Supper, which was especially abhorred by the Romanists. Melanchthon, in order not to endanger the cause of the Lutherans, or, more particularly, the

4 Cf. Kolde in *R. E.* on "Marburger Religionsgespraeche," XII, 249, 10ff.

5 Ibid. p. 108; cf. 116, 117.

cause of his elector⁶ did not risk to meet Bucer personally while at Augsburg, because of the latter's association with Zwingli in the past. And because of their leaning to Zwingli most of the Cities of Upper Germany were not permitted to subscribe the Augsburg Confession.⁷

After the adjourning of the Augsburg Diet the cities of Upper Germany⁸ found themselves in a precarious situation. In case of attack by the emperor they would be the first to be overrun. They saw that their salvation was in the direction of a union with Wittenberg. In April 1532 these cities joined the Smalcald Federation by subscribing to the Augsburg Confession along with their own Confessions which they were not asked to renounce. This joining of the Smalcald Federation, however, did not mean a religious acknowledging of these Upper Germans by the Lutherans. To bring about a confessional union which at the same time would strengthen the political ties was the task to which Martin Bucer devoted himself with an indefatigable zeal.

Of what kind was the union that Bucer was aiming at? He meant it as a union that should include the Zwinglians, and he meant it as a union by compromise.

As was stated already, the cities in the South, with the exception of Nuremberg and Reutlingen, had not been permitted to sign the Augsburg Confession so that Strasbourg, Constance, Lindau and Memmingen had to hand in a Confession of their own: the Tetrapolitana.⁹ This document in the composition of which Bucer had an important part they themselves characterized as being "neither Lutheran nor Zwinglian."¹⁰ This was not without a purpose. The way for a future union with the Wittenbergers was to be kept open. At the same time it was

6 Cf. Neve, "Lutheran Symbolics (Columbus, O.), p. 85f.

7 Mueller in R. E. XIX, 560, 38, 55; 561, 7.

8 Strasbourg, Constance, Memmingen, Lindau, Ulm, Biberach, and Augsburg had not been permitted to sign the Confession of the Saxons.

9 See article by Mueller in R. E. XIX, 560, 54.

10 Ibidem, with reference to Dobel, Memmingen im Reformationszeitalter, part IV, p. 42.

hoped that it would serve the Swiss as a bridge to Lutheranism.¹¹

It was upon this basis ("neither Lutheran nor Zwinglian") that Bucer proceeded with his endeavours at uniting the two wings of Protestantism. He persuaded himself that Luther and Zwingli had not understood each other; that the seemingly consubstantial expressions in Luther's *Grosses Bekenntnis vom Abendmahl*¹² were not intended to convey what they seemed to teach; also that Zwingli would be willing to admit a positive gift in the Supper, besides the mere symbolical meaning of it. In Strasburg they had always emphasized the presence of Christ's whole person in the Supper, communicating himself to the believers. The question was now how he could induce Luther to abandon some of his realism, and move Zwingli to add to his signification theory.

As a key for solving the difficulty he brought a phrase into play, which he had already employed in a writing of 1528 (a year and a half before the Marburg Colloquy) under the title "*Vergleichung Dr. Luther's und seines Gegenteils vom Abendmahl Christi*," namely that Christ was present in a "sacramental" way.¹³ He now spoke of a "sacramental presence" of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist. This brought him nearer to Luther. He

¹¹ Cf. Kawerau in Moeller, III, p. 113; Mueller in R. E. XIX, 564, 4. Article XVIII of the "Tetrapolitana" deals with the Lord's Supper. It is there said "that in this Sacrament Christ gives to his disciples and believers His true Body, truly to eat and to drink as a meat for the souls, and for eternal life." Quoted by Kolde in R. E. XXI, 561, 43ff. This sentence reveals the median type of teaching as it prevailed in Strasburg. Heppe, in "Konfessionelle Entwicklung der altprotestantischen Kirche" (p. 74) calls attention to the avoidance of the phrase customary with Luther "in the bread" (in pane). But note in the above quoted sentence especially the emphasis upon the teaching which was characteristic of the Strasburgers in their subsequent dealing with Luther namely that the true Body and Blood is received only by the believers. As to the Zwinglianizing tendencies with regard to other articles of faith, see Mueller in R. E. XIX, p. 561, 49ff. The fundamental difference from Rome was also brought out a great deal stronger than in the Augsburg Confession. The Roman Mass is condemned in most severe language: "ein grausamer Krempelmarkt," "ein unleidlicher Greuel." Ibid. p. 561, 55. Cf. Heppe, pp. 73, 74.

¹² Erl. Ed. XXX, 151ff.

¹³ Gruenberg, in R. E. III, 608, 34, article "Martin Bucer."

admitted that bread and wine are not mere signs, but *signa exhibitiva*. While the bread is eaten the Body of Christ is truly offered and received. The union between bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ, however, does not consist in any mixture of what these heavenly and earthly elements are in their true essentiality, but it is a "sacramental union."¹⁴

To this Confession of Bucer Luther could not object, because he also rejected the impanation theory and a Capernaite eating and drinking.¹⁵ Nevertheless, Bucer found it exceedingly difficult to satisfy Luther who feared that the phrase "sacramental presence" might be used for placing a spiritualistic interpretation upon whatever the other side might admit in the direction of the Real Presence. Bucer soon saw that he could expect no concessions to the Zwinglian side from Luther. To make sure that he would not be deceived with spiritualistic interpretations of definitions which in themselves were not objectionable Luther even declared through Melancthon, at the meeting in Cassel (1535) "that in and with the bread the Body of Christ is eaten in such a way that all which the bread works and suffers the Body of Christ works and suffers; that the Body is distributed, eaten and manducated (*mit den Zaehnen zerbissen*)."¹⁶ In this

14 Cf. the reports by Gruenberg in R. E. III, 609, 30; by Kolde in R. E. XXI, 391, 14; by Koestlin-Kawerau, Martin Luther II, 330; Corp. Ref. II, 807, 827.

15 See Formula of Concord, Epitome, art. VII, Affirmative 6; Negative 20; cf. art. VIII, Aff. 12. Solid Decl. VII, 64.

16 De Wette, Briefe Luthers IV, 559f. Melancthon, in a letter to Cammerarius, said that he could bring this message only as a reporter of an opinion that was not his own (*nuntius alienae sententiae*). Corp. Ref. II, 822. Kawerau says: "Nowhere else has Luther uttered his view with an expression that sounds so offensive as he did at this occasion. It is true that he used the same words in his very severe controversy with Zwingli in his *Grosses Bekenntnis vom Abendmahl* (1528, Luther's Works, Erl. Ed. XXX, p. 297), but not without immediately qualifying his statement. At this moment he chose to make his declaration brief and sharp (*schroff*). So much he desired reliably to establish the actual attitude of Bucer to his teaching and to ward off the appearance as if people who are opposed to it had united with him, or that he himself had abandoned his original position." (Koestlin-Kawerau II, 329). Compare the language of the Formula of Concord on this subject (Part II, Art. VII, 105).

practice of painstaking care to guard the doctrine of the Real Presence Luther continued through all his negotiations with Bucer. When after that meeting in Cassel the latter defended himself by employing terms that were unobjectionable Luther wrote characteristically: "If they mean in their heart what their words say then I know at this time not how to reproach them."¹⁷ Against the pleading of Bucer that the people at Strasburg felt deeply against a teaching according to which the Body of Christ is received also by the unbelievers he remained unyielding; all that Bucer succeeded in wresting from Luther at that final conference in Wittenberg (1536) was the permission to make that artificial and unmaintainable distinction between *unbelievers* and *unworthy*.¹⁸

We see that as far as Luther was concerned Bucer's intention to bring about a union by compromise was not realized. The Wittenberg Concord is a Lutheran document all through.¹⁹ What was the attitude of the Swiss

17 Wo ihr Herz stehet wie die Worte lauten, so weiss ich auf diesmal die Worte nicht zu strafen. Koestlin-Kawerau II, 331.

18 Cf. Gruenberg, R. E. III, 609, 50. Kolde R. E. XXI, 394, 38. Koestlin-Kawerau II, 340.

19 Kolde, R. E. XXI, 396, 36. The text of the Wittenberg Concord is found in the Corp. Ref. III, 375ff. It is translated into English in Jacobs' Book of Concord (not People's Edition) II, 253. We miss this document in Schaff's Creeds of Christendom. In the Wittenberg Concord we have, first, articles concerning the Lord's Supper. The first article says that with (cum) bread and wine Christ's Body and Blood are truly and essentially present, offered and received. The second article rejects impanation and the existence of the Body outside of the action in the Sacrament. The third teaches the Real Presence independent of the worthiness of the servant of the Church and of the receiver, as long as the administration takes place according to the institution of Christ. The "unworthy" receive the Sacrament to their judgment. There was discussion also with regard to Baptism, particularly with regard to infant faith. Here they agreed "that through Baptism there come to infants the forgiveness of original sin, and the gift of the Holy Ghost who is efficacious in them (the children) according to their measure..... Although we do not understand of what nature this action of God in infants is, nevertheless it is certain that in them new and holy movements are wrought..... For although we must not imagine that infants understand, nevertheless these movements and inclinations to believe Christ, and love God, are, in a measure, like the movements of faith and love. This is what we say when we say that infants have faith. For we speak thus that it may be understood that infants cannot become holy and be saved without the divine action in them." The Bap-

to Bucer's mediating activity, and how was the Wittenberg Concord received by the South German cities?

We hear that even Zwingli, when Bucer first visited him after he had seen Luther in Coburg (1530), admitted the presence of Christ's Body in the Supper. But he qualified his statement by saying that it was not a *bodily* presence.²⁰ Fisher says correctly: "Zwingli was not the man to veil his opinions."²¹ When Bucer soon afterwards drew up a formula in which he employed the words *corpus verum* Zwingli objected, at first moderately,²² but soon in very strong language.²³ Bullinger, after the death of Zwingli, in a Confession of 1534, shows a certain approach to the Tetrapolitana.²⁴ But he is far from an admission of the Real Presence in Luther's sense. In February 1536, about three months before the Wittenberg Concord, was signed, the First Helvetic Confession was composed.²⁵ In this Confession there was progress over the original position of Zwingli in that the Sacraments were defined as consisting not only in signs, but also in essential things to be communicated. These are the "true communion of His Body and Blood," which then is qualified as *Himself* given to the believers for the strengthening of faith.²⁶ It was impossible for Bucer to reconcile Luther to such statements.

tism in case of extreme necessity (Nottaufe) was justified. Private absolution to which there had been opposition in the South was admitted, because of the opportunity it affords to comfort the spiritually depressed and to instruct the religiously ignorant; auricular confession was rejected. (Meusel, Kirchl. Handlexikon VII, p. 287. Lutheran Cyclopaedia, p. 545. Kolde, R. E. XXI, 395, 11).

20 Kolde in R. E. XXI, p. 388, 1.

21 Fisher, History of Doctrines, p. 290.

22 Kolde ut supra, p. 389, 22.

23 Ibid. p. 389, 22-27.

24 Koestlin-Kawerau II, 327.

25 Bucer himself had co-operated in the construction of this document. The authors agreed that it should not be published for the present as the outcome of the meeting with the Lutherans (in May) was to be awaited. Schaff, Creeds I, 388f. Kolde ut supra, p. 392, 45.

26 This Confession is contained in Schaff's Creeds of Christendom III, 211ff. Cf. Koestlin-Kawerau II, 334. Seeberg, History of Doctrines II, 390. Heppel, ut supra, p. 84. The point of interest is in the question: What did Bucer mean when he three months later agreed to the terms in the Wittenberg Concord?

But what was the attitude of the Cities of Upper Germany to the Wittenberg Concord? After hesitation on the part of some²⁷ all subscribed. But those of the Cities that had developed in their Reformation views under the influences from the South never ceased to interpret Art. X of the Augsburg Confession in the light of that median type as represented in the Tetrapolitana, which always formed the background for Bucer's approaches to the Lutheran position.²⁸ The Real Presence was to them, as to Bucer, a spiritual one. As Christ's Body is spiritual so there was to them only one way of receiving, namely through the spirit of the believer.²⁹

The Wittenberg Concord failed to accomplish the union that Bucer was laboring for. Luther tried for a number of years his utmost to win the Swiss. Up to two years before his death he abstained from all controversy against the Zwinglians in the hope that by such attitude a union on the basis of the Real Presence might develop.³⁰ But he found that his silence was more and more interpreted as an abandonment of his former position. Even

²⁷ Ulm, for instance, where they talked of the "new doctrine" which their representative had brought home from Wittenberg. Kolde, referring to his book *Analecta Lutherana*, p. 280f.

²⁸ Moeller's *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. III by Kawerau, p. 125.

²⁹ Cf. Koestlin-Kawerau II, 390f. Loofs, p. 879. Heppe, pp. 76, 48.

³⁰ Here is of special interest a letter which Luther wrote under the date of December first, 1537, to the followers of Zwingli in Zuerich. It was an answer to a letter received from them, in which they had emphasized their conception of a merely spiritual presence in the Eucharist. In this letter Luther prays to God that he might be permitted to complete the work of reconciliation begun in the Wittenberg Concord, and he asks them to work for the same end. For himself and his friends he promises that in writing and preaching they would be quiet and mild, in order not to interfere with the development. And, referring to the difference in the doctrine of the Sacrament, he wrote: "Since we do not yet understand each other fully, it is well to exercise mutual kindness, and always hope the best until all turpid waters have fully settled." The letter of the Swiss is given in Enders' *Briefwechsel* XI, 157f., together with Luther's answer (Latin), p. 157. German in the *Historie des Sakramentsstreits*, p. 400; also in Enders XI, 204 and in Erl. Ed. of Luther's Works, LV, 190. Extracts of both letters are given in Koestlin-Kawerau II, pp. 350 and 352; also in Planck, *Geschichte des Protestant. Lehrbegriffs* III, Book 8, p. 399ff.

Schwenkfeld prided himself with being upon common ground with him.³¹ His consent to removing the practice of elevation at celebrating the Lord's Supper in the Wittenberg Churches was taken as proof of his conversion to the spiritualistic views of his former opponents.³² In the publication of the First Helvetic Confession he saw the determination of Bullinger and his friends in Zuerich to resist the Real Presence conception. Furthermore, since that meeting in Cassel (1534), referred to above, he had observed with growing concern the changing attitude of Melanchthon.³³

As standard-bearer of the Real Presence which he saw founded in the Scriptures and which he always regarded as essential to his system of teaching he feels his responsibility for transmitting it to the Protestant Church of the future. In 1543 he announced: "After so many Confessions which I have published I must send out one more; I shall do it soon, and it will be my last."³⁴ As a final impulse for carrying out this plan there came into his hands, in the summer of 1544, a document, prepared by Bucer and Melanchthon, which contained articles of faith for introducing the Reformation in the city of Cologne. Here Bucer's mediating interpretation of the Real Presence was openly expressed, with an ignoring even of the Wittenberg Concord.³⁵ In Sept. 1544 Luther

31 Corp. Ref. III, 983ff.; IV, 797. De Wette, Briefe V, 463, 613f.

32 De Wette, Briefe V, 236. Corp. Ref. III, 488; IV, 735.

33 Koestlin-Kawerau II, 335. Regarding the relation of Melanchthon's Variata edition of the Augsburg Confession to the general union movement see Neve, Lutheran Symbolics, pp. 208ff.; cf. pp. 91ff.

34 De Wette V, 644f. "Ich muss deshalb nach so vielen Bekenntnissen, die ich getan, noch eines ausgehen lassen; das will ich ehestens machen, und es soll mein letztes sein."

35 Together with bread and wine Christ offers truly His Body. He who firmly believes the promise receives Christ's Body truly for his salvation. There was nothing said of a receiving also by the "unworthy." Advice was given to dismiss "all fleshly thoughts in this mystery." Luther characterized the document with the following words: Es treibt lange viel Geschwaetz von Nutzen, Frucht und Ehre des Sakraments, aber von der Substanz mummelt es, dass man nicht vernehmen soll, was es davon halte, in aller Maasse wie die Schwaermer tun. De Wette, Briefe V, 572ff., 577. Corp. Ref. V, 313f., 293, 304.

published his Brief Confession of the Lord's Supper.³⁶ In very sharp language he rejects the teaching of Carlstadt, Zwingli, Oecolampadius and Schwenkfeldt (He calls him Stenkefeldt), and points his finger at "their disciples in Zuerich and wherever they are."

This publication marks the final failing of the Wittenberg Concord and with it the failing of the union movements of the sixteenth century as far as the relation between Lutherans and Reformed is concerned.

There is a question that forces itself upon us, and this would be the place to attempt an answer. *Why was Luther so unyielding at Marburg and here in his dealing with Bucer and with the Swiss?* To charge common stubbornness would be very unhistorical. Prof. J. P. Fischer says in his History of Doctrines (p. 290): "It is not to Luther's discredit that he had no relish for the ambiguities of compromise"; and Phil. Schaff, writing of Bucer³⁷ says, "He labored with indefatigable zeal for an evangelical union and hoped to attain it by elastic compromise formulas. . . which concealed the real difference and in the end satisfied neither party." No, Luther had a very serious reason for his unyielding position. He stood for a religious interest in which his conscience was involved. Prof. Kawerau, himself a man of the Prussian Union, in discussing the Marburg Coloquy, has a fine appreciation of the religious interest for which Luther stood in his conflict with Zwingli.³⁸ The Sacrament, Kawerau explains, was to Luther an act in which God incarnate Himself condescends to seal for the individual the forgiveness of his sins. He insists upon a receiving of Christ's Body also by the unworthy because, as he said, the reality of Christ's appointed gift must never be made dependent upon our thinking and believing.³⁹ It is the principle of realism that goes through his whole system. We see it

³⁶ Kurtz Bekenntnis D. Martin Luther's vom Heiligen Sakrament. Erl. Ed. XXXII, 379.

³⁷ Creeds I, 526.

³⁸ Moeller, Kirchengeschichte, vol. III, by Kawerau, 3rd. ed., p. 89f.

³⁹ Koestlin-Kawerau II, 339.

in his conception of the Word as a means of grace just as much as in his teaching of the Sacrament. Stripped of Luther's conception of the Real Presence, the historical Lutheran Church goes out of existence. If this one doctrine is untenable then a whole number of other tenets of Lutheranism, that are based upon the same principle, must go, and historical Lutheranism is no more. Much of what is called Lutheranism in Germany has gradually become another thing, simply because this one cornerstone, the Real Presence and what goes with it, has been abandoned or has been relegated to the sphere of indifference. It is of special interest to observe that the different Norwegian bodies of Lutherans in our country have united upon the old historical Lutheran platform, and that the English speaking bodies of Lutherans, the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod of the South, are effecting their union upon the same basis. There is among all the Lutheran synods of America not one that does not emphasize Luther's doctrine of the Real Presence; not simply because Luther taught it—there are many teachings of Luther, which the Lutheran Church has not symbolized—but because they accept Luther's principle of realism in exegesis and because they see that the doctrines of Lutheranism are an organism from which it is impossible to eliminate one part without affecting the life of the whole. Luther stood for distinct religious interests, he could not yield, and under the historical circumstances he *had to* sound, before his death, the note that went out with his last confession in 1544. He might have done it with less violence, but his declaration that he was yet standing upon the old ground was one that had to be made.

The question has been asked whether Bucer was sincere in his mediating activities. He was charged with insincerity both from the Zwinglian and the Lutheran side. The Zwinglians, that is Bullinger and his friends in Zuerich, mistrusted his interpretation of the Wittenberg Concord, and in a meeting at Basle (1536) they decided to find out the truth by submitting his statements

to Luther,⁴⁰ and Bucer had times when it was hard for him to convince the Swiss of his honesty.⁴¹ Luther, on the other hand, met Bucer with much distrust at Coburg (1530). He wrote: *Martin Bucer nihil respondeo*.⁴² And while he at times put great confidence in him and welcomed him heartily yet there were moments when he feared that he could not trust him and that he had to test his sincerity.⁴³ Even after the agreement upon the Wittenberg Concord in 1536 he felt an aversion to Bucer's diplomatic activities in trying to win the Swiss to a recognition of the new basis by saying that a real difference between the two sides was not existing, and he admonished him to desist from representations not quite in harmony with truth.⁴⁴ Amsdorf and Osiander had no confidence in Bucer. The charge of insincerity has been repeated by many historians. To arrive at a fair judgment we need, of course, to think of the difficulty of the task he had set before himself. Then we need to consider that when he spoke of a truly "essential" presence of Christ's Body (purposely avoiding Luther's term "substantial") he always meant by that only a *spiritual* presence.⁴⁵ When he rejected consubstantiation⁴⁶ he meant by that more than the Formula of Concord does. This was Luther's constant fear. But if we remember the persistency with which he in all his dealings with Luther did reject consubstantiation and emphasized a sacramental union (which however, in his mind was not quite the same as what the Lutherans understood by that term), if we call to our mind the letter which he wrote to Luther after that meeting with Melanchthon in Cassel (1534),⁴⁷ in which he frankly explained to what extent

40 Koestlin-Kawerau II, 350.

41 Kolde R. E. XXI, 398, 24.

42 Enders' Briefwechsel VIII, 258.

43 See Kolde ut supra, 393, 25. Koestlin-Kawerau II, 331, 338.

44 Ibid. 351.

45 Ibid. 348.

46 Ibid. 330. Corp. Ref. II, 809f; cf. 826f. Referred to by Kolde ut supra 391, 17-30.

47 Quoted in extract by Koestlin-Kawerau II, 331.

only he could agree with him, if we finally think of how he at that meeting at Wittenberg (1536) when Luther insisted upon a receiving of the Body also by the unbelievers, consented only to a receiving by the unworthy, by which he meant those "who are in the Church and have faith, yet do not discern the Lord's Body, do not properly estimate this gift of Christ":⁴⁸ it seems to us that in consideration of all this it cannot be maintained that Bucer was intentionally insincere. He honestly believed that there was a middle ground upon which Luther and his opponents could meet if they only understood each other.⁴⁹ His was the Strasburg type of teaching. He stands in the history of the Reformation as "the great compromise theologian" (Seeberg II, 390), but because there is no middle ground between the realistic and the spiritualistic position⁵⁰ he became "the stepping stone to Calvinism."⁵¹ The fact is that Bucer regarded the whole object of controversy as of only minor importance. His biographer in the *R. E.* says: He had more appreciation of Luther's occasional stubbornness than of his religious motives in the matter. For this reason he was always so easily ready for large concessions and for ever new formulations.⁵²

The Wittenberg Concord failed and yet there is traceable to this document and its negotiations a number of positive results which we shall enumerate at the close of this discussion: (1) The polemics between Luther and his opponents ceased for a number of years. (2) This served for the strengthening of the Smalcald Federation. (3) The cities of Upper Germany were drawn into a common confessional interest with the Lutherans. (4)

⁴⁸ Ibid. 348; cf. Luth. Cyclopedica, p. 545.

⁴⁹ With regard to whether Bucer was sincere see Gruenberg in *R. E.* III, 610, 32ff.

⁵⁰ It is not without interest for the student of the History of Doctrines to observe that from the beginning of Christianity there were in the Church the two views, the realistic and the spiritualistic. In Irenaeus for instance we have Luther's realistic position while in Origen we have the spiritualistic teaching of Berengar, Zwingli, Bullinger, and Calvin.

⁵¹ Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte* 879.

⁵² Gruenberg in *R. E.* III, 610, 40ff.

Thus a way was paved for future Calvinistic influences upon German Protestantism. (5) Melanchthon became encouraged in his efforts at modifying original Lutheranism.⁵³ (6) Philip of Hessa also was encouraged in the endeavors which he inaugurated at Marburg. It is, therefore, only historically logical that in centuries following Hessa (or parts of Hessa) introduced the union. (7) But it may also be traced to the negotiations leading to the Wittenberg Concord that later in the Prussian Union as in the union movements in other parts of Germany Lutheranism became the predominating element.⁵⁴ (8) The most important among the positive results was the lesson that a union by compromise between Lutherans and Reformed, doctrinally speaking, is an impossibility. If in following centuries any union between Lutherans and Reformed did succeed it was not by a compromise in the field of doctrine.

53 "Bucerism is the contemporaneous pendant of Melanchthonian Lutheranism," Seeberg II, 393. Cf. Heppe 75, 84. Koestlin-Kawerau II, 328.

54 Cf. Heppe 82.

ARTICLE VIII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

During this Quadricentennial year the quarterlies of all denominations have given much space to the Reformation and to Luther, who is universally recognized as the supreme instrumentality of God in restoring apostolic Christianity. There are some curious criticisms of Luther by those who do not understand him and are out of harmony with his teachings on the sacraments and with his Christology. It is extraordinary, however, that so little fault can justly be found with a man who lived in a rude age of the world and had to deal with many unprincipled opponents.

It is proper that the "current theological thought" in the present number of the *QUARTERLY* should reflect the opinions on Luther as they appeared in the several quarterlies of October, 1917.

Professor John Wright Buckham, of the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal., writes of "Luther's Place in Modern Theology" in *The American Journal of Theology*. He says:

As a theologian Luther was fully equipped. His knowledge of the Scriptures was extensive and scholarly as well as experimental and practical, enabling him to make his translation of the Bible a monumental achievement. Hebrew was a delight to him, Greek was an everyday affair, Latin was the language of his class-room and of most of his writings. He was conversant, if not familiar, with the Church Fathers. Augustine was one of his master minds. Scholasticism was to him both friend and foe. "No one shall teach me scholastic theology; I know it," he declared. Occam he jestingly calls *meus magister*. Indeed, it was a growing distrust of Scholasticism, with its hairsplitting and syllogizing and frequent

puerility, and its winking at a conscienceless doctrine of "good works," which awoke in him the inner revolt that finally issued in the German Reformation. It is true he failed to recognize the best Scholasticism. Aristotle was to him only a "blind heathen." Aquinas he knew but slightly and appreciated less. Yet he understood something of the strengths as well as the weaknesses of this masterly school of theology.

On the whole we have in Luther a true theologian, and manifestly no ordinary one. What we have from him is no closed system, but outspoken, open-hearted, vital theology, free and breezy and inconsistent, like the man. * *

Let us begin with a fundamental and determinative characteristic of Luther's theology which has been too largely overlooked, i. e., its Christocentric character. It will come to be realized, I venture to predict, that the Christocentric emphasis of Luther's theology is one of its most outstanding features, in contrast with Catholicism on the one hand and Calvinism on the other. Both his affection and his thought centered in Christ, "from whom, by whom, and unto whom, all my divine studies, day and night, have recourse to and fro continually." It is commonly held that the chief and most distinctive doctrine of Luther is that of justification by faith. This is doubtless true in the main, for it is his own assertion that, "if the article of justification be once lost, then is all true Christian doctrine lost." But it is not true in any such abstract and academic sense as that in which the phrase is usually employed. Luther was anything but philosophical or theoretical in his thinking. He was concrete, vital, personal. It was not justification, in the forensic sense that concerned him, or faith, in the theoretic sense. What he desired for himself and for others was relief from the burden of sin, someone to whom to turn for peace of mind and redeeming strength. * * * *

In close accord with its indomitable hold upon Christ, another pronounced trait of Luther's theology is, as has already been suggested, its experimental character. Indeed, the present emphasis upon experience as the sub-

stratum of theology—one of the most fruitful discoveries of modern theology—has made large account of the fundamental place of experience in Luther's theology. Not that Luther himself explicitly recognized that his theology issued from experience. He had no theological theory except the priority of faith over reason. He simply entered into the truths of religion whole-heartedly and let his theology flow from this experience naturally and fructifyingly. Here is the secret of his power, both as preacher and writer: "I believe, therefore have I spoken." * * * *

A third characteristic quality of Luther's theological thinking, and one that attests its modern as well as its New Testament character, is its *ethical integrity*. It is no fabric of intellectual sheen; it is no reed shaken by the wind of emotion, but stands steady and strong, knit of firm moral fiber. The ethical interest is uppermost in this valiant soul. He is no friend of aestheticism, or romanticism, or speculation, or anything that minimizes morals. He constantly decries "reason" in the sense of pure intellect. In a forceful comment on the third verse of the first chapter of Galatians he has some very positive and pithy things to say about the folly of treating salvation merely as an intellectual affair. * * * *

There is, moreover, at the heart of Luther's faith a principle upon which we dwelt at the outset of the paper, which carries with it large hope of a reunited Christendom, i. e., its experimental, Christocentric character. If in place of creedal, dogmatic, historical and governmental bases of unity the common bond of union shall come to be—as, in fact, it is coming more and more to be—Christian experience (however diverse in form) centering in Christ, surely we shall possess the foundation for a unity embracing both the solidarity of Catholicism and the freedom and individualism of Protestantism. When that union comes, the man who nailed the theses to the church door at Wittenberg, who wrote such vindications of the church of the spirit as *The Liberty of a Christian Man* and *The Babylonish Captivity of the Church*, and who

aroused the world to the power and possibilities of Christian faith will be recognized—in spite of his own limited vision—as one of its chief founders and furtherers.

In the same number of the *Journal* Prof. W. H. T. Dau, of St. Louis, writes of "Luther's Relation to Lutheranism and the American Lutheran Church." Of the American Lutheran Church he says:

The body of Christians in America who are known as Lutherans can be said, upon the whole, to be sincerely and intelligently devoted to the principles for which Luther and his associates stood four hundred years ago. There have been periods in the history of the American Lutheran Church when rationalism threatened to become dominant in it, and other periods when pietism seemed to hold sway. There have also been sad defections from the Lutheran standards by individual Lutherans and by Lutheran congregations in America; the early Lutheran Swedes have to a large extent been absorbed by the Episcopal Church; in the early part of the nineteenth century the revivalism which swept the country at that time carried Lutherans into the Methodist Churches, and, in general, a tendency to adapt Lutheran teaching to the tenets of the large and influential Protestant Churches in America was developed in the oldest general body of the Lutheran Church. This movement at one time assumed formidable proportions, although it operated with a gross misunderstanding of Lutheran teaching and was guilty of a plain self-contradiction; it denounced the binding authority of the Lutheran confessions and at the same time framed a declaration of principles that was to serve as the creed of the new party. It denounced true evangelical doctrines because of their seeming similarity to the Roman Catholic tenets. But the movement was short-lived. The Lutherans in America can be credited with having realized, even in periods of apparent retrogression, the importance of the fundamental principles of the Reformation—salvation by grace through faith in Christ and the inspired Word of God as the sole norm and authority in all

matters pertaining to the teaching and practice of the Church.

The cosmopolitan character and the splendid vitality of the Lutheran Church has been exhibited by the wise methods which have been adopted by American Lutherans for the propagation of the Lutheran Church under conditions that differed considerably from those prevailing in Europe. There has also grown up a distinctively American Lutheran literature that is increasing with the advancing years. The one grievous problem which has vexed the American Lutheran Church repeatedly—the so-called language question—is being solved with commendable skill and in a spirit of conservatism, both in the German and the Scandinavian sections of the Lutheran Church in America. The American-born generations of Lutherans naturally grow away from the languages of their immigrant ancestors, and thus the native English of America is being readily adopted in the public worship of congregations that formally were German, Swedish, Norwegian, etc. The only concern of loyal Lutherans in America is to carry over through these transition periods into the new era the heritage of the old historic faith proclaimed for the first time in systematic form in Augsburg in 1530.

Prof. W. W. Barnes of Fort Worth, Texas, treats of "Luther's View of the Church" in the *Review and Expositor*.

Luther taught that the Christian Church is a community of believers in Christ, a holy community which imparts its holiness to its members; this community is self-governing, its united will being expressed through a general council; for the sake of order in the administration of the sacraments, this community can empower certain individuals with the authority to administer them; these individuals may exercise the governing powers also; but when through neglect or misuse of these powers scandal results, the civil governors, by virtue of their being members of the Christian community and

priests, may take charge; and against this community the gates of Hades shall never prevail, but it shall continue until the Lord comes again.

Dr. E. C. Dargan, of Nashville, writes in the same *Review* of "Luther as a Preacher," as follows:

When we come to the language and style of Luther's sermons, our admiration chimes with that of his own contemporaries. It must have been a delight indeed to hear him. Even his Catholic critics pay just tribute to his eloquence, and generally his oratorical qualities. Thus the Abbe G. Renoux, in his study of celebrated German preachers, remarks that Luther was a born orator, who had the "spark" and facilities, "the masterful air"; that he was endowed with the "most precious intellectual gifts"; that Catholic as well as Protestant historians and critics have recognized his oratorical genius. The truth is that Luther was gifted with a splendid imagination, with deep sympathy, and with depth of conviction and earnestness of soul. The moving power of great speaking was in the man, and it can be traced even in the imperfect remains of his discourses. He was keen in his observation of nature and life, vivid in description, clever, as well as pungent, in application, shrewd and clear in argument, and powerful in impression. He had an admirable pulpit style. He knew how to think with the learned and talk to the unlearned. When he chose to do so, he could use the common phrases, and make his word intelligible to the common man. He could be homely when that was proper, but delicate and sweet and charming when these qualities were called for. In brief, he was a versatile speaker; one of the truly great orators that have arisen among men.

Dr. George B. Eager, of Louisville, discusses "Luther as a Social Influence." We quote the following:

In his appeal to the nobility of the German nation, Luther voiced as no other had done the grievances of the German people. He touched upon all the open sores of

the time, foretelling dire disaster if they were left unhealed. Measured by its effect, it is not too much to say that it was "the greatest political pamphlet ever issued." It threw into the scale of a great constitutional struggle a decisive weight, and brought about politico-religious conditions in Germany that remain to this day. He reminded the nobles of the former advice he had given which they had not taken. For the present disturbed state of things they had nobody to thank but themselves. Things had come to such a pass that the people could stand them no longer. "Now it is not the peasants, dear lords, but God who arrays Himself against you." The peasants' demands were in the main so reasonable that it was a shame for them to have to make them. In a word, he said, the peasants were in a condition of hopeless wretchedness, and yet their demands were denied and even greater burdens imposed. * * * *

The Reformation is important to us to-day, not so much for what it immediately accomplished, as for what it made possible. It shattered many idols and false ideals, and the new ideas it furnished have ruled the world ever since. The new spirit survived the attempts of its frightened leaders to imprison it, and is the spirit of the modern world. The essence of that spirit is that nothing is to be held as truth merely because it is old; nothing is to be accepted on authority unless it be the authority of truth itself; that everything is subject to investigation, and that only which bears the test of Scriptures, reason and experience can make good its claims to be truth.

Concerning Luther's "Table Talk" a reviewer writes the following in the *Harvard Theological Review*.

It is safe to say that no man ever lived whose scattered utterances could be more variously interpreted than those of Luther can be and have been. He can be praised or blamed as heartily as any one pleases, and both praise and blame can be justified out of his own mouth. And while this may be said of all his writing and speaking it is especially true of the so-called Table-Talk, at once the most

popular and the least trustworthy of his published utterances. The method—or lack of method—by which this compilation was thrown together is briefly described in the editor's Introduction and in one short chapter. Nothing could well be more casual. First one then another, sometimes several at a time, of Luther's younger table companions jotted down as they were spoken as many of his words as they could catch, and these random notes were then recast into something like literary form. They are of interest as showing the immense variety of subjects on which a great man's mind was working and his mental attitude at different moments toward the problems which his restless activity forced upon him. On the other hand, they are as dangerous a source as can well be imagined for any serious judgment of the Reformer's character or his permanent and constructive opinions.

"The Personal Side of Luther" is presented in *The Homiletic Review* by Dr. Preserved Smith. We quote a single paragraph.

Luther was, indeed, absolutely disinterested. Few men have ever cared less for money or reputation than did he. If ever any one's eye was single and his whole life given up to the service of a cause, it was that of the Wittenberg professor. It has been said that the two great tests of a man's character are found in his relations to women and to money. In both of these the German's standard was perfect. Though we may regret the coarseness of his words, there is no unchastity in his acts for which apology must be made. And of money he thought scarcely ever, except when he wanted it to help someone else. He even borrowed to lend to others, and he gave freely and almost recklessly. His hospitality was another phase of the trait. The house where he lived, the former Augustinian friary, was more of a public institution after it was deeded to him than before. In its capacious walls were sheltered a dozen or more poor relatives, a constant quota of fugitives from other lands and

of distinguished visitors, and a large but fluctuating number of students at the university.

Professor George W. Richards, of the Reformed Seminary at Lancaster, writes suggestively in the same *Review* of Luther as a Church Historian.

When Luther came to the University of Erfurt, history was not included in its curriculum, though the humanists there read Livy, Lucan, Tacitus, and Thucydides. The catalogue of the University of Wittenberg makes no mention of historical studies in the early part of the sixteenth century. Luther's student days were spent in an atmosphere of philosophy and philology. Aristotle and St. Thomas shared the throne. History came to its own only after the Reformers had spent their days. As early as 1524 Luther deplored this fact when he writes: "Yes, how sorry I am that I did not read more the poets and historians and learn of them. Instead I had to read the devil's trash (Dreck), the philosophers and sophists, with great cost, labor, and harm."

If Luther did not write history, he was by no means without the historical sense which profoundly influenced his reformatory work. What is the historical sense? The recognition that the present is the product of the past, that the living are the heirs of the dead, that God's purposes are realized through continued historical processes, that men accept with grateful reverence institutions of Church and State so long as they are in harmony with truth and righteousness. "Others have labored and ye entered into the labor." (John 4:38). From youth up he had a love for things historical, which, in his manhood, enabled him to value aright historical facts and to use with irresistible skill historical arguments against his opponents. His insight into history became clearer and deeper as he progressed in his reforms and pursued indefatigably his historical studies.

"Luther as a Hymn-Writer" is presented by Musical Dr. Pratt, of Hartford Seminary.

Luther was a genuine pioneer in Protestant hymnody. He naturally became the model for the early hymnists of Germany, and it can be shown that his example had much to do with the spirit and style of hymnody in other countries. He explicitly called for successors and imitators and foresaw something of the inestimable glory which they were to shed upon Christian faith and experience in ages beyond his own.

By his hymns, as by his monumental translation of the Bible, he brought High German to definition as a language. One wonders to-day at the crystalline brilliance of his verbal expression, at his facility and felicity, at his fusion of homely earnestness with richness of sentiment. In all these regards he is not only the mold of a language, but also the founder of a noble literature.

The Princeton Theological Review (Oct.) is devoted entirely to the Reformation. With his usual learning Dr. B. B. Warfield discussed "The Ninety-five Theses in their Theological Significance." He finds in these Theses "a bold, an astonishingly bold, and a powerful and astonishingly powerful, assertion of the evangelical doctrine of salvation, embodied in a searching, well-compacted, and thoroughly wrought-out refutation of the sacerdotal conception, as the underlying foundation on which the edifice of the indulgence-traffic was raised." He expresses surprise at the superficial view taken of the Theses by A. Plummer, T. M. Lindsay and Philip Schaff "The Roman Curia had no difficulty in perceiving precisely where Luther's blow fell." "It must not be imagined," says Dr. Warfield, "that these Theses were hastily prepared merely to meet a sudden emergency created by Tetzel's preaching at Jüterbog. Luther had preached on indulgences on the same day, October 31, of the preceding year, and in the midsummer (July 27) before that. * * * They are, therefore, the deliberate expression of long-meditated and thoroughly matured thought." "In these Theses Luther brought out of the academic circle in which he had hitherto moved, and cast into the arena

of the wide world conflicts, under circumstances which attracted and held the attention of men, his newly found evangelical principle, thrown out into sharp contrast with the established sacerdotalism. It is this that made the posting of these Theses the first act of the Reformation, and has rightly made October thirty-first the birthday of the Reformation.

Dr. David Schley Schaff contributes an article on Luther and Calvin in which with rare discrimination he contrasts and compares these Reformers. In accounting for them he says "All sorts of psychological explainings may be attempted to account for the passage of these Reformers from the old system to the new as has recently been done by the eminent scholars, Denifle and Grisar, but they all break to pieces upon the simple facts that Luther and Calvin came to their views in the careful study of the Scriptures and apart from any collusion to break up the old system."

"In their careers the two differed widely. No mortal man of historic note has had so many dramatic scenes in his career on Luther. * * * We will not say that one was more heroic than the other; but the events of Luther's life were of the essence of the Reformation as a world movement. They belong as parts of the onward march of history." "In the two leading spiritual principles of the Reformation, the final authority of the Scriptures and justification by faith, they were fully agreed."

"Luther found the truth by instinctive perception." "Calvin reached the truth by the intellectual and reflective faculty, through a process." "Calvin did not find any new spiritual light in the Scriptures which Luther had not found." "Calvin was a legislator and a disciplinarian * * Luther had no taste for administration."

In their personal lives Luther and Calvin were pure and conscientious. In their attitude toward God, the former regarded Him as Father; the latter as Sovereign. "Luther's home is the model home. His Christmas songs are sung by every Protestant German household." "Of

Calvin men think as austere, but unsocial; unsympathetic with the common instincts of mankind. * * He is still an exile. His career and his work remain those of an alien in the land which gave him birth."

Dr. George L. Robinson in discussing "Galatians, the Epistle of Protestantism," concludes as follows:

"Perhaps we shall not preach the great doctrine of Justification by Faith exactly "as our fathers did," but if Bancroft is correct, "the principle of justification by faith alone brought with it the freedom of individual thought and conscience against authority. Perhaps we shall not preach it "as our fathers did," but if Henry Ward Beecher was right "our civil liberty is the result of the open Bible which Luther gave us."

He quotes Daniel Webster at Bunker Hill as saying "the Reformation of Luther introduced the principle of civil liberty into the wilderness of North America." He quotes Bishop Thorold: "The free millions of the United States may well rise up and do Luther honor by cherishing his example, pondering his history, and maintaining his creed." Dr. Frederick H. Hedge: "To Martin Luther above all men, we Anglo-Americans are indebted for national independence and mental freedom." Charles Dudley Warner: "Every man in western Europe and in America is leading a different life to-day from what he would have led had Martin Luther not lived."

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

FLEMING H. REVELL CO. NEW YORK AND CHICAGO.

The Christ We Forget: A Life of Our Lord for Men of To-day. By P. Whitwell Wilson. 8vo. Cloth bound. Pages XVI + 328. Price \$1.50.

Few books of the past year outside the realm of fiction and books dealing directly with the war have attracted so much attention as this volume by Mr. Wilson. For a long time it stood well up in the weekly list of "best sellers." There are no doubt several reasons for this.

One of these may be that it was written by a layman, without any special denominational or dogmatic standpoint or aim. The author is a well-known and popular English journalist, the grandson of Jonathan Bagster, the publisher of the famous "Bagster Bible." He is quite fully introduced to his readers in this country by the publishers. This is a feature of the volume which we desire to commend. We have often wondered why this was not done by publishers generally. It certainly adds greatly to our pleasure in reading a book to know something about the personality and the life and work of the author.

While the book does not deal directly with The Great War, it seems to have been born of the war. This also may have added to the interest which it has awakened. In his introduction the author calls attention to the indifference to spiritual things which prevailed before the war. He says: "It seemed almost unnecessary to find time for the Bible. Many of us were making money, others were busily earning it. Our children were getting on nicely at school. Certainly there were grave evils, like drink, and bitter social inequalities, and rancorous political quarrels, and reckless extravagances, which gave us uneasy twinges of conscience. But we drifted, in tens, hundreds of thousands, from public worship. We ceased to pray. We quietly laid aside the Bible."

Then came the great war. Men were suddenly brought again face to face with facts which they had forgotten. "One of these facts was Death—another was Pain—another was Hatred—another was National Duty—another

was Suspense. We learnt that life is not a game, but a grim, heroic combat between good and evil." For this crisis men were wholly unprepared. They sought refuge and help in all kinds of things, spiritualism, crystal-gazing, fortune-telling, pleasure, romance, work, sacrifice. But none of these proved sufficient. They needed something deeper and stronger, something more divine. They needed religion, the neglected God, the forgotten Christ. How were they to get back to these? The author answers, "by reading the forgotten Bible."

Evidently this was the path which Mr. Wilson himself followed, and in his book he is trying to tell others some of the things which the Bible taught him, especially the four gospels, with their simple, thrilling story of the Christ who is too often forgotten. He says: "Unless I am mistaken, if you read with perseverance and resolution, you will discover things in the Bible about which you will want to talk to others. That was my own situation, and thus it is that you have these pages."

The author's unconventional style has no doubt been another attraction. He does not write as a theologian, not even as a historian. He writes more as a journalist, a reporter, telling the simple story of the things that he himself has seen, and heard, or experienced, and doing it all in the interesting straightforward way of the modern first-class newspaper man. He makes no claims to any great erudition. Indeed, he rather scouts the scholars and the critics who are so prone to allow their scholarship and their critical attitude of mind to obscure the truth, and to push the Christ into the background or to throw doubt on His teaching. In fact, we have read one reviewer who complains bitterly of Mr. Wilson's lack of respect for "the assured results" of modern investigation, and "the consensus of opinion" of modern scholarship. One is not surprised at this complaint from the source from which it comes, when he recalls a passage like the following from Mr. Wilson's pen: "Why should you be enslaved any longer by destructive criticisms, usually made in Germany, where, as we now know, the simplest diplomatic document can be perverted and misrepresented by the very scholars who, for thirty years, have dictated unto us our theology? I don't believe, and I never did believe, one-hundredth part of the invective hypotheses by which the Bible has been surrounded and obscured. By their fruits ye know them." Or this from the first chapter, referring to the variations in the reports of the Sermon on the Mount by Matthew and Luke:

"As one who has devoted his life to the task of summarizing speeches, and can speak with a practical experience not possessed by any critical scholar, who spends his time among books, I am entitled to the opinion that these are vivid and nervous accounts, of a real utterance, by a real Teacher—the variations showing that we have here, not error or carelessness, but the corroboration of more than one witness. And when I am told by German critics that our Lord could not have uttered the discourses set out in the Fourth Gospel, I appeal once more to my own experience. I have been writing some anonymous articles which aroused curiosity. Not only have my friends decided, on internal evidence as it is called, that I did not write them, but I have heard already of one person, of high literary attainments, who does not deny that he is the author. If one considers how literature is actually produced, one becomes profoundly skeptical of what are called the results of modern research."

But no doubt the deepest attraction and the real power of this "Life of our Lord for Men of To-day," are to be found in the simple faith and the profound spiritual insight which are evident all through. We may not always agree with all his explanations of our Lord's life, or of His words and works, or be ready to accept all his deductions from them. But there is hardly a page on which we may not find some fresh thought, set forth in a way to stimulate our own thought, or to give us new light on or help from something that Jesus said or did, or from what He was. Take this as an example: "Look, for instance, at the Pharisee and the Publican, both going up into the Temple to pray. Each of them addressed his prayer to God. But the Pharisee claimed God's praise, while the Publican begged for God's mercy. The Pharisee judged himself by the lowest standard—by comparison with the extortioner, the unjust, and the adulterer; while the Publican, with bowed head, submitted himself to the highest. The Pharisee went away, therefore, unwarned (as John puts it) of the wrath to come, while the Publican was 'justified'—that is, was brought into line with righteous standards. The same act of devotion lulled one man to sleep, and stirred the other to repentance."

Here are several more quotations which will explain themselves: "If as a nation we had followed John's teaching, and spent on missions what we now have to spend on war, who knows what guarantees of peace and justice we might not have established in the world? One way or the other, we have to learn the lesson, that our

incomes are not our own. Caesar will have our money or God will have it, but in Christ's accountancy there is no third column for self."

"To many people, thrift is a virtue because it implies self-control in the present and foresight for the future. But if Jesus had substituted a bank balance for a Father's care, His teaching would have excluded nine out of ten wage-earners. He was against laying up treasures on earth, because He realized that all property is liable, first, to moth and rust, by which are meant the depreciation that results inevitably from postponed use; and, second, to theft, with violence, like war. We read, too, of the farmer whose barns were full, but who did not sow his surplus corn or sell it for bread, so as to relieve the market, but pulled down his barns, which was waste of property, in order to build greater, which was waste of work; yet overlooked his own health. This financier was a fool, because he only thought of his assets; forgetting his liabilities, which included a mortgage on his soul, due to a sleepless Creditor, who foreclosed that very night after business hours. Wealth unspent made the rich man a miser."

"'Cast thyself down' sums up all the arts of sensationalism, whereby we advertise our religion, our politics, our arts, our social position. The preacher who depends on language, on epigram, on voice and gesture—who attracts admiration to himself and thinks of how it will strike the public—that man, that woman, is very near the peril of the pinnacle." "To us, a miracle arouses faith. To Him, a miracle rewarded faith." "The miracles that He achieved—amazing though they were—were less of miracles than those which, having the power, He refused to perform. It was true, as Satan said, that He could command the angels—twelve legions of them—who would have kept Him in all His ways, including Gethsemane. Neither on the pinnacle nor in the garden did He summon them. He won all His victories without the big battalions. He could have come down from the Cross and left the thieves impotently hanging there. But He refused the very narcotic which would have eased His sufferings, and in consciousness and sanity drained the dregs of what He had to undergo. His greatest miracle was not of Power, but of Love; and that Love was God."

"God is not only Truth, but Power; so that, throughout our Lord's career, we have the word and the work in close alliance, each inseparable from the other. I say this with emphasis, because there is often a complete misapprehen-

sion of the scope of this 'sermon' [on the Mount]. People think that it contains the Gospel of salvation, and is, therefore, the essence of Christianity. I venture to assert that the Sermon on the Mount did not save one person who heard it! We read therein not what we can be, but what we should be, and the question how we are to be what we ought to be is left deliberately unanswered. It was just because Christ's law was unattainable that His Redemption had to be freely accessible to everyone."

It would be a dull preacher, indeed, we think, who could not get the germs of at least one sermon from every page in the book.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

LUTHERAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION. COLUMBIA, S. C.

Biblical Dogmatics. By Andrew George Voigt, D.D., LL.D. Professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C. Cloth. Pp. xx. 244. Price \$1.50.

Dr. Voigt shows himself a master of his subject. His clear, orderly and fresh treatment of dogmatic theology makes his *Biblical Dogmatics* a valuable addition to the minister's library. The scheme of arrangement is as follows: The Communion of Man with God through Jesus Christ: 1. Grounded in God, 2. Established in the Creation of the World and of Man, 3. Disturbed by Sin, 4. Restored in the Redemption through Christ (a) Provided in the gracious purpose of God, (b) Realized in the Person and Work of Christ, (c) Applied by the Holy Spirit in the Church through the Means of Grace, 5. Consummated in the World to Come. These several topics are presented in the chapters.

The author accepts the Bible as the Word of God, inspired by the Holy Spirit. Inspiration is not mechanical but dynamic. "The Spirit dynamically co-operated in the writing, not as an author behind the author, but as God works in and through men, heightening, purifying, directing conceptions and experiences." Inspiration is to be predicated not only of the men who were moved by the Spirit, but also of their writings. Dr. Voigt, therefore, believes that "the only ultimate source of Christian doctrine is the revelation of God contained in the Bible." Here is the seat of authority in religion.

"Biblical Dogmatics" is the statement and the development of doctrine from the Christian point of view. While

the author finds himself practically in accord with the accepted teaching of the orthodox Church, he affirms that it is the function of dogmatics not blindly to accept and to defend dogmas, but to state truth and to search for "fuller, purer and better views" than may have been hitherto attained.

The Method of Treatment is thetical. Each topic is introduced by a thesis or a definition. For instance, in discussing "The Nature of God" we have first the thesis: "God is a Person, who in Himself is perfect life, and whose essential nature is love." This is then further elucidated.

Dr. Voigt finds no difficulty in harmonizing science and the Bible. He dismisses the subject by saying that "attempts to harmonize the six days with science have no significance for dogmatics, however satisfying they may be to the Christian student of modern science." "Man," says the author, "is a specially created being. He did not spring from the ground as an autochthon, as the ancients supposed, nor was he evolved from lower forms of life, as some modern science teaches."

The great fundamental teachings concerning God and man—his certain fall and redemption—are faithfully set forth. The author shows that sin demands atonement and that Christ made propitiation for us through His obedience unto death. In this connection it seems to us that the bare statement (p. 136) "The Bible speaks of God reconciling men, *not of being reconciled*" conveys a false impression, and is really contradicted by the sentences following. We quote, "It denied that God needed to be reconciled by Christ. But this is a mistake. * * * God was reconciled by Christ."

Dr. Voigt encounters the usual difficulties in the Application of Redemption and the Order of Salvation. The re-birth of a soul is mysterious; it cannot be fully defined. It defies logic. It is full of paradoxes; but it none the less is real, true and blessed. Moreover, the words used in the discussion of the whole subject of conversion do not have the same content in the writings of different authors or periods. The Lutheran Symbolical Books are not always consistent in the use of language, and attempt to reconcile the several meanings given to a term is often quite impossible.

Our author treats faith and justification very well until we meet with the startling statement (p. 171) that "justification is not to be included in the order of salvation, as has often been done in doctrinal treatises; it is the

divine background and substratum of the life of faith." But surely he does not mean to say that justification precedes faith, for the Bible plainly affirms that we are "justified by faith." Nor can he mean that we are justified regardless of faith by divine election. To us faith, justification, repentance, regeneration and so forth all go together.

We are mystified again by the author's treatment of regeneration, which he defines (p. 177) as "the act of the Holy Spirit by which he begins a new spiritual life in a person living the natural life of sin." This is good, but lo, he goes on to say that "regeneration is essentially the same as justification," and (p. 179) "In the New Testament regeneration expresses a new relation, not an inward transformation. It is the gift of God's grace and forgiveness, therefore essentially the same as justification." This is full of confusion. It confounds the objective and the subjective. There is no proof of the assertion in the Bible, and as far as we know no Lutheran teacher in the American Church will side with Dr. Voigt in identifying justification and regeneration. On the contrary, they seek to guard against this error. Dr. Valentine regards regeneration as a quickening by the Holy Spirit. Dr. Jacobs says, "It is that act of the Holy Spirit, by which the soul, previously spiritually dead, becomes spiritually alive." (*Elements of Religion*, p. 181). It is "the act of the Holy Spirit by which new and spiritual life is imparted to man who is dead in sins." (*Summary of the Christian Faith*, p. 229). Dr. F. W. Steinhorn (in *Lutheran Cyclopedia*) says, "As a theological term it denotes both the divine act of bringing about the new birth and the state and condition of a man who is born again." Prof. F. Pieper, of the Missourians, speaks of the "regenerating grace" of God as producing "a new spiritual life." (*Distinctive Doctrines*, p. 160, 161).

We trust that Dr. Voigt, in future editions of his excellent treatise, will restate the teachings on justification and regeneration.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY. NEW YORK.

Franklin Spencer Spalding; Man and Bishop. By John Howard Melish. Cloth binding. Royal 8vo. Pp. 279.

Is biography coming back into its own again? There are some indications that such is the case. It is to be

hoped that they will be justified by the facts. There is no more interesting reading than the biography of a really great and good man or woman, especially when well written. There is no reading more profitable. If the poet was right when he wrote, "The proper study of mankind is man," and we believe that he was, then we should all read more biography.

In the volume before us Dr. Melish, who is rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity in Brooklyn, has given us an interesting story of a very interesting character and a very forceful and useful life. He begins very properly with Bishop Spalding's early life, first as a boy in the home, then as a lad in school, and later as a student in Princeton University. Then we have a chapter on "The Choice of a Profession," and another on his experiences as a "Theological Student."

Young Spalding took his theological course at the General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church in New York City, where he seems not to have been very happy because of the extreme High Churchism and ritualism of the faculty. He and also his father, who was the Bishop of Colorado, were supposed to be High Churchmen themselves, and so called themselves, but the teaching and practices at the General Seminary went so far beyond anything of which he had conceived before that he could not feel at home. In a letter to his father written from the seminary he says, "When I decided to come here I did it because I thought I could do more good as a clergyman than as a lawyer, and that if I had any talents which would have helped me in the law they would help me also as a preacher of Christ. But I am instructed that the preaching and active part of the work is a minor matter and that the priestly part of the work, which it seems to me a half-witted ignoramus can do, is the great and almost the only work of importance." As his biographer says, "He had gone to the seminary thinking it was a school of the prophets, a laboratory of the workers, and he found it to be a drill-ground of the priests."

Young Spalding entered the seminary in the fall of 1888. In the spring of 1891 he was ordained to the diaconate by his father and a year later he was advanced to the priesthood. The intervening year he had charge of a mission in Denver and was very successful. Then, at the request of his father, he took charge of the diocesan school for boys as the head-master. After about five years of this work, which he did not find very congenial, he accepted a call to a strong church in Erie, Pennsylvania.

It was here that his real work and his larger development began. In 1904 he was elected missionary bishop of the District of Utah, and for the next ten years until his untimely death in September 1914, he devoted himself with an almost apostolic zeal and self-abnegation to the care and development of his diocese. Both as rector and as bishop he proved himself a man of virile character and independent thought and judgment.

The title of his biography is significant: "Franklin Spencer Spalding; Man and Bishop." The man is put before the bishop and deservedly so. Not only was he a man before he was a bishop, but he evidently continued to be more of a man than a bishop after he was elevated to the episcopacy. At least the man never was lost in the bishop. He seems never to have had any love or much respect for the honors of the office, and none at all for the many petty conventions of dress and dignity of which so many of his brother bishops made so much.

Again and again in his letters to his intimate friends, as well as in private conversation, he protested against the emphasis which some churchmen placed on the mere insignia of office and the order of precedence, matters of robes, and rings, and crosses, and the question of who should be first, etc. To him none of these things mattered, and he never could understand how they could matter so much to any really earnest and consecrated servant of Christ and of the Church.

He does not seem to have taken much stock in the boasted claims of Apostolic Succession for the bishops of the Anglican and the Episcopal Churches. In a letter written to his father after his consecration as a bishop, he writes: "I am reading Moberly's book on Apostolic Succession and it is fast destroying every atom of belief I ever had in that doctrine. It seems to me to be a *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory which it is intended to support. Every argument would be equally valid for the divine right of kings. If the President of the United States is a lawful ruler and called of God then, by the logic of Mr. Moberly, it would seem to follow that a Congregational minister must also be, and vice versa. If the Congregational minister is not a lawful minister then the President of the United States is not a lawful ruler. The book is proof to me that an Englishman is incompetent to write a book on the ministry. He is blinded by the strength and culture of the established Church to the value of Dissent."

Bishop Spalding seems also to have clearly seen the fu-

tility of all efforts of the Anglican and Episcopal Churches to bring about the unity of Protestantism so long as they insist on the recognition of the Historic Episcopate and the re-ordination of all clergymen not episcopally ordained, as one of the conditions of it. He frankly recognized the fact that the ministers of the other denominations never would and never could submit to this. Hence we are not surprised to read in his biography that he had no use for the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order, and that to him such a proposal "was much as if, when a convention of mothers had shown complete unanimity of opinion in praising the glory and dignity of motherhood and the beauty and promise of childhood, some wise one should decide that it would be a good time to secure agreement on the best formula for sterilizing milk. . . . Christian unity will never come until the followers of Jesus Christ realize that His religion depends not upon exact thinking, but upon Christ-like living."

Early in his ministry in Erie Mr. Spalding became profoundly interested in the Social Problem. The Church of which he was the rector supported a mission in a part of the city where practically all the men were mechanics and day laborers. His interest in the work of this mission brought him into touch with these workmen and with their problems, and he made a careful study of the whole subject. He had an innate love of justice and fairness. He was open-minded and broad-spirited. He came to have a growing sympathy with the point of view of the workers, and with their protest against the inequality of their condition as compared with that of the capitalistic classes, and especially against what they regarded as the unequal and unfair division of the products of their labor between them and their employers.

Ultimately he became an open and avowed Socialist and so far allied himself with the Socialist party as to cast his vote for the Socialist candidate for the Presidency, Eugene V. Debs. This alienated from him many of his most valued friends both among the clergy and among the laity. It also alienated some of the most liberal supporters of his work. This gave him great pain, but he never wavered because of it either in his own convictions or in his earnest advocacy of them on all proper occasions.

A very storm of opposition broke against him when, in 1913, he delivered a most eloquent address before the General Convention in New York on the Church and Democracy. The sentiments of the address seemed quite

revolutionary to many of the wealthy laymen present, and no less so to many of the bishops who enjoyed fat livings and wished to keep on good terms with their rich friends and patrons. His biographer compares him to the prophet Amos at Bethel, and to Savonarola in the Duomo in Florence. He gives the following quotation from the address, and it is not difficult to understand why such utterances would not be acceptable to the bishops of rich dioceses and the rectors of wealthy churches, or to the great merchants and manufacturers and corporation lawyers who usually make up a very considerable part of the General Convention membership: "Surely there can be no doubt on which side the Church of Jesus Christ ought to stand, where the issue is between dollars and men. She must stand on the solid ground of economic truth. She must learn that labor, not capital, is the basis of all value, that men at their worst are worth more than dollars at their best. . . . She must take her place on the side of the worker, giving him, from her Master, self-control and courage and hope and faith, so that he may fight his battle and win his victory, which is not his victory alone, but the victory of society; the victory of co-operation, of love over selfishness. . . . The Church, if she is to be a real power in the Twentieth Century, must cease to be merely the almoner of the rich and become the champion of the poor."

Bishop Spalding was run down on the streets of Salt Lake City, on the evening of September 24, 1914, by an automobile driven at terrific speed by a reckless girl, and was instantly killed. He was in his fiftieth year and in the very prime of life and at the height of his usefulness. We commend this biography to ministers especially as being full of interest and of inspiration to the highest and best things in the service of the Master, and of the Church and the world.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

The Church and the Man. By Donald Hankey. Cloth. Pp. xx. 89. Price 60 cents.

Mr. Hankey, who was "killed in action on the Somme, 12th October, 1916," served in the British army and was known as "the beloved Captain." He was a deeply religious man, with a very varied experience in different lands and in all kinds of employment. His ultimate aim in life was to bring men to Christ, whom he found as the Saviour of his soul. *The Church and the Man* was writ-

ten with the object to make "the Church a better, a more efficient, a more vital, and a more healthy body." His viewpoint is that of the "average man"—very practical, not always strictly orthodox.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

African Missionary Heroes and Heroines. By H. K. W. Kumm. Six Lectures given before the College of Missions, Indianapolis, Indiana. Cloth. Pp. xvii. 215, including Index. Price \$1.25.

The Introduction describes very briefly the Dark Continent in reference to size, wealth, climate and people. The book is devoted to "character sketches" of a number of great men and women who have given their lives for Africa—Perpetua of the second century, Queen Cahina of the seventh, Wilmot, Crowther, Coillard, Grenfell, Kraff, Mary Slessor, Mackay, Tucker, Moffatt and Livingstone.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Immortality, An Essay in Discovery, co-ordinating scientific, psychical and biblical research. By B. H. Streeter, A. Clutton-Brock, C. W. Emmet, J. A. Hadfield and the author of *Pro-Christo et Ecclesia*. Cloth. Pp. xiv, 380. Price \$2.25.

This composite volume of nine essays is stimulating in its treatment of certain great themes. The first three essays set forth the main arguments for immortality. The next three deal with the nature of the after-life, of the Resurrection, Judgment, Heaven and Hell. The seventh discusses "the good and the evil in Spiritualism"; the eighth treats of Reincarnation, Karma and Theosophy, and the final one "the Undiscovered Country."

Dr. Hadfield, Surgeon in the Royal Navy, clearly shows the independence of the mind over all physical influence. He gives numerous and apparently well authenticated illustrations from Hypnotism and Telepathy indicating the power of the human will. He proves that science confirms the belief in immortality.

The credibility of the Resurrection and the possibility of a spiritual "body" are clearly set forth. The volume shows the folly of Christian Science and Theosophy; and its discussions are on the whole sane. Nevertheless, it denies the historicity of portions of the Gospels; it affirms the false teaching of restoration, and also of anni-

hilation; it refuses to accept the biblical teachings concerning Hell; and it is friendly toward the idea of a "Protestant" purgatory, and the propriety of praying for the dead. There are also some pantheistic intimations in such expressions that "Before our birth we were undifferentiated 'soul'; we were parts of the 'cosmic mind'; we were as water drawn in a pitcher from the 'mind pool.'"

J. A. SINGMASTER.

A Theology for the Social Gospel. By Professor Walter Rauschenbusch. Cloth. Pp. 279. Price \$1.50.

This volume contains in an elaborate form four lectures delivered on the Nathaniel W. Taylor Foundation before the Annual Convocation of the Yale School of Religion. Dr. Rauschenbusch disclaims any pretensions to being a theologian. He is a teacher of Church History and a student of social problems, which he believes of the highest importance for religion and theology.

In the Foreword, Dr. Rauschenbusch says: "The Taylor Lectures are expected to deal with some theme in Doctrinal Theology, but the Faculty in their invitation indicated that a discussion of some phase of the social problem would be welcome. I have tried to obey this suggestion and still to remain well within the original purpose of the Foundation by taking as my subject, *A Theology for the Social Gospel.*" Not knowing the exact conditions of the Foundation, we express no opinion as to the propriety of allowing a divergence from the apparent object of the founder. While we must admire the conscientious endeavor of the lecturer "to remain well within the original purpose of the Foundation," we are sure that he is not in sympathy with "Doctrinal Theology" and that he looks upon it as hindrance rather than as help in the promulgation of a "social gospel"—whatever that may mean. The author claims that "it is the revival of the most ancient and authentic gospel, and the scientific unfolding of essential elements of Christian doctrine which have remained undeveloped all too long." p. 26.

The burden of the book is the arraignment of "doctrinal theology" as the cause of all the sins of Church as far as they pertain to the "social" omissions. Granted that the Church has failed in a measure in the practical application of the Gospel to the community and to the world, the author has failed to show in what way theology is responsible. In a vague manner he tries to show

that the orthodox teachings concerning the Fall based on epistles of Paul, are a hindrance to salvation. But his logic breaks down all along the line. He condemns and approves in the same breath. If there were any arguments to refute, we should undertake the task, but there are none. Assertions are not arguments. The author, who confesses that he is "not a doctrinal theologian either by professional training or by personal habits of mind" has completely misunderstood and perhaps unwittingly misrepresented the teachings and the spirit of "doctrinal theology." He evidently does not know the content and purpose of theology. We would assure him that there is nothing in systematic theology, as it is taught as far as we know in any conservative Theological Seminary in America, which would stand in the way of the conversion and the edification of any community and which does not constantly teach the solidarity of society and labor for the brotherhood of all mankind. We could illustrate this fact, if we cared to, from the lives of eminent theologians and conservative preachers who are foremost in promoting "social welfare."

Men, like our author, fail to see that as far as society is in a wholesome and happy state, it has come to this state by the preaching of the old, everlasting truths of the Bible. Perhaps, these men are in some instances disgruntled because the Church has not been willing to follow them in all kinds of so-called "reforms." In some cases, no doubt, the Church has been too indifferent. But it is absurd to affirm that because evil men have crept into the Church and have weakened it, that the blame lies with a theology which teaches that Adam fell, that man has a corrupt heart, that he is a deliberate sinner, that God hates sin and that there is an evil spirit. But the author and his class must charge "wind-mills"!

The function of "doctrinal theology" is to set forth doctrine in an orderly man. Its function is not preaching. The Spirit of God through the preaching of the Word alone can awaken and convert sinners. To put converted sinners to work to create new social life is a practical work of the Church, but it certainly is not the immediate function of theology.

It is not the function of the best congregation that ever existed to formally organize the community for police duty or the creation of all kinds of societies for the public good. It is its business to leaven society, to prepare men for citizenship, to make a Christian State possible, and to hold up the high ideal of brotherhood. The Church, as

such, has no specific training for sanitation, for law-making, and for the abolition of poverty among the unchurched. Whenever the Church has left its high sphere as a spiritual institution and has directly and in a corporate manner invaded the domain of the State, it has lost its influence, as the history of the Roman Catholic Church shows.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. NEW YORK.

Lectures on the Church and the Sacraments. By P. T. Forsyth, M.A., D.D., Principal of Hackney College, Hampstead; and Dean of the Faculty of Theology in the University of London. Cloth. Pp. 289. Price \$2.00 net.

Dr. Forsyth defines his theological attitude as "neither current Anglican nor popular Protestant." He writes from the Free Church camp but not from any recognized Free Church position. His view of the sacraments is "neither memorial and Zwinglian nor is it High Church. It is sacramental but not sacramentarian, effective but not sacrificial."

"The Word does not mean the Bible, but the whole medium of communication between God's soul and man's. As this was gathered to a head in Christ, Christ is the unique Word of God." Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, the author says, have undervalued "the Gospel as the power of a Holy God for our moral redemption in a kingdom." The former sacrifices everything for the sake of unity; the latter for the sake of liberty. "As to sacraments the author holds a mere memorialism to be a more fatal error than the Mass, a far less lovely." So much by way of introduction.

The first part of the book discusses the Church in its essential character as holy and as united, and in its purpose as a kingdom. Its ministry as an office was instituted by Christ. The first Apostolate is incommunicable. The continuity lies in the message and not in the order. The seven chapters devoted to the Church are full of earnest thought, expressed in striking sentences.

The Church is holy, if it be anything. It must live on what founded it—the positive New Testament Gospel, on the Cross of holy, judging, saving love. Its great business is to save souls. Its survival, in spite of its defalcations, shows its indestructibility. It is "the only society

on earth whose battle is already won. The Church chiefly exists to certify that that battle was won in what was done by Christ." "It is the only society with a fulcrum outside the world."

While giving due credit to the Free Churches of England, to local and personal religion, the author blames them for being "*too atomist*." Their independence has been overdone and their multiplication has resulted in duplication and confusion. They have lost "the sense of the great Church." Moreover, they are too *negative* in their note, too suspicious of what exists in other churches, more apt to criticise than to create. They are too negligent of the Bible. "Most people make so little personal use of the Bible that they do not know if an interesting preacher is preaching the Gospel or not." The need of the Church is not a new theology but a renovated theology, in which orthodoxy is deepened and not pared away. "*Theological liberalism, abroad and at home, thins down into Unitarianism infallibly.*"

Dr. Forsyth scores both the Anglican Church and the Free Church for their sectarianism in not having the world-view of the Gospel. A recent report of the Archbishop's committee on Church and State does not once mention the dissenting churches which embrace one-half of the nation. The Free Churches have been too narrow in their conception of Grace and the Divine Fatherhood, and have starved themselves in not claiming "the rich treasury of Christian devotion in the profound and lovely liturgies of the long past."

As to the reunion of the Churches, the author asks, "Must we then go to Canossa? Must we wait at the gates of the traditional and imperial Churches, cap in hand? Must we return as penitent prodigals and be reabsorbed in some form of Catholicism, either Roman or Anglican? Nay, there is a more excellent way—the way of federation. * * The note of the future, the true reunion, is federation with a relative constitutional independence. It is no new monarchy, but the *United States of the Church.*"

The second part of the volume treats of the Sacraments. The first chapter (the eighth of the volume), contributed by Professor Andrews, a colleague of the author, is a lucid exposition of "the Place of the Sacraments in the Teaching of Paul." He affirms that the tendency of modern Free Church theologians has been either to ignore the sacramental elements in the teachings of St. Paul or to assume that his views are in accord with their

own. This is illustrated in the case of Bruce who held that Paul taught that baptism had merely a symbolical significance. Bruce has been challenged by even those who have not the "slightest bias towards sacramentarianism." Among these may be mentioned Wernle, Pfeiderer, Lake, Weinel, Feine, Titius, Heitmüller and Schweitzer, all of whom have come to the decision that the sacramental principle is a vital element in Paul's teaching.

Taking all these views and the plain meaning of certain passages, Dr. Andrews declares that "it becomes very doubtful whether any theory that falls short of the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation will adequately explain the utterance of St. Paul in reference to the Eucharist." We regret that so able a scholar as Dr. Andrews should ascribe consubstantiation to the Lutheran Church which has always protested that it does not hold this doctrine. Nevertheless, it is probable that Dr. Andrews has in mind the true Lutheran view of the real presence; and it is gratifying that the truth as confessed by the Lutheran Church should have recognition from this source. We call attention also to an unusual signification which is given to the word "sacramentarian" throughout the volume. It is used as indicating the real presence or a high view of the sacraments. In the language of the Reformers it means the very opposite. Luther stigmatized the Zwinglians as "sacramentarians."

Dr. Andrews says that if the Exegesis be correct the sacramentarian interpretation has won a decisive victory over the symbolical. In view of this what should Free Church theologians do? One of two courses remain: either to revise their conceptions and return to the teaching of Paul and hence of Luther, or to explain it away! This latter can be done only by supposing that Paul "borrowed the categories of Greek religion to explain the meaning of the Christian sacraments"! Dr. Andrews does not decide, but refers the question to the theologians.

Dr. Forsyth takes high ground on baptism and the Eucharist, and deplores the indifference and error of the Free Churches concerning the sacraments. He is alarmed when he considers that a mere natural view of the child is taken and that God's ordinance is neglected. He holds that the sacraments are the bearers of grace and not mere signs. Holy baptism does not "simply wash away; it floods with new life. It is not negative for the cleansing of the soul, but positive for the gift of the Holy Ghost and union with Christ in His life as well as in His death."

Infant baptism, says the author, is found in the New Testament in *principle* and is right, but not in *practice*. We would, of course, take issue with him in reference to its absence from practice, which is clearly implied and connoted. He is correct in saying that the sacraments can effect only what the Word does. As to infant regeneration, he excludes rightly all that savors of magic. He allows "baptismal regeneration" to the believer. Baptized children have a right to all the blessings of the Church and they are in the covenant of grace.

In regard to the Eucharist, the author goes so far as to say that it is an *opus operatum*, meaning thereby that it confers grace upon the believer. He comes very near to the Lutheran view when he says that "the sacramental unity was a personal one." "The body means the entire person and presence of Christ." It seems to us that Dr. Forsyth does not fully understand the Lutheran view; but he is evidently in full sympathy with the idea that the sacraments are real means of grace, conveying to the believer that which they signify. We rejoice in this, for the sacraments are either means of grace or empty ceremonies. Mere memorials and symbols are of temporary value, and history shows that where the sacraments are thus regarded they soon fall into neglect.

We commend this volume to the attention of all studious ministers.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE ABINGDON PRESS. 150 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK CITY.

Recovered Yesterdays in Literature. By William A. Quayle. 8vo. Pp. Cloth. Gold top. Price \$1.50 net.

Bishop Quayle sees men and women and books with the eyes of a perpetual youthfulness and writes of them in a clear, brilliant style which, while it is thoroughly his own, has been enriched by a long and intimate acquaintance with great books in many languages. It is difficult to choose favorites among the nine essays which make up this volume, since each has a charm and value of its own.

"The Literature of Nature" traces the growth of mankind's consciousness of and enjoyment of the beauties of nature. The author comments upon the great store of nature description in the Bible. Here, he says, are "bleak mountain, wide plain, houseless night, hosts of stars, wicked sea, fading flowers, the withering vine, shorn meadows, stately palm, spreading cedar, brawny oak,

opening rose, flaunting lily, dry waterbrook, rushing stream, still Galilee, longed-for dawn, sky red with sunset, wash of sea wave, sag of tempestuous water, perfumes from the wheat fields." "The Bible is not less the book of outdoors because it is the book of the hid places of the soul. The Pleiades are there and the brown desert smoking to the feet of running beasts or echoing to the lion's roar."

Among the modern writers who love the sea the author selects for especial comment Norman Duncan with his cruel, icy Labrador storms and Joseph Conrad with his southern and even more appalling tempests. His account of Conrad's description is not unworthy Conrad himself.

"'The Children of the Sea' is Conrad's sea at wrath and is away and beyond the maddest, mightiest, most effective effort ever made by man to catch the triumphal fury of the angry deep. The effort is so gigantic and terrible and formidable, so crushing, so compelling, as to set a seal of silence on the lips that would coin admiration into words. The waves crush, thunder, applaud their own fury, drench, build green precipices, lurch like drunken devils, stammer as if affecting the oratory of eternity, blur the sky with their skirts of spray."

Another essay to be loved is "A Poet Chrysostom," an appreciation of Francis Thompson, especially of that tremendous ode "The Hound of Heaven" which "hurts to heal," which expresses as no other poem in the world expresses the love of God for mankind. It is difficult to write even a review of an essay about Francis Thompson without copying out, as Bishop Quayle has copied, the concluding stanza of "The Hound of Heaven."

How has thou merited—
Of all man's clotted clay the dingiest clot?
Alack, thou knowest not
How little worthy of My love thou art!
Whom wilt thou find to love ignoble thee
Save Me, save only Me?
All which I took from thee, I did but take,
Not for thy harms,
But just that thou might'st seek it in My arms.
All which thy child's mistake
Fancies as lost I have stored for thee at home:
Rise, clasp My hand and come."
Halts by me that footfall:
Is my gloom after all,

Shade of His hand, outstretched caressingly?
"Ah, fondest, blindest, weakest,
I am He whom thou seekest!
Thou dravest love from thee, who dravest Me."

Charles Lamb is not only the subject of the last essay "Once Again with Elia," but he seems to have guided the pen of his lover and admirer. If the subject were not Lamb himself, the essay might be bound with his. No finer tribute has ever been paid to that tender soul, once so troubled and now so dearly treasured, than in Bishop Quayle's concluding paragraphs.

"What a weary, sad story that brother and sister story of Charles and Mary Lamb is! It is become an imperishable treasure. It is a family secret of us all now. If half or near to all the doings of this world's storied kings were wiped from the world's recollection, we should not be visibly impoverished. Most of what they did was so feverish, so theatrical, so grimy with self as to fairly anger us now and make us snarly with those contemporaries who could be amused and awed by such cheap theatricals. They are competent now solely to awaken a languid smile. But this brother-sister love of these common folk is imperishable music. Elia wrote no essay so felicitous as his unwearying love for poor, demented Mary. His heart was ever at the window, watching as mothers are. In his sleep I think you could have heard Elia whisper, 'Mary, sister, do you need Charles?'

"Who can name the English lords in the days when Charles Lamb was king of the quiet poetry of the realm of sacrifice? Truly, we neither know nor care. They are second-hand men of little title to renown when Elia is near. We forget them, but never him!"

"Recovered Yesterdays in Literature" will have, it is certain, no merely ephemeral history. There is in it too much that is real and beautiful and valuable.

E. S. L.

The Life of Jesus. By Harris Franklin Rall. 12mo. Cloth binding. Pp. 214. Price 75 cents net.

This volume belongs to what is known as the "Kingdom of God Series," edited by Henry H. Meyer and David G. Downey. It is described as "a course in the development of the Kingdom of God," and is meant for the use of adult weekday religious instruction. The series is to include seven volumes and is divided into four parts. Part I

deals with "Old Testament Times," in two volumes. Part II treats of "The Life and Teachings of Jesus," also in two volumes. The general topic of Part III is "Since the Time of Christ," to which two volumes are given. Part IV has only one volume on "The Christian Hope." The editors announce that these studies "are intended to meet the increasing demand for modern text-books written in scholarly spirit but popular style."

The book under review, which is volume one of Part II on "The Life and Teachings of Jesus," contains twenty-six studies. The first chapter covers the period between the Old and the New Testaments, giving special attention to the story of the Maccabees. The next two chapters aim to present the religious and political situation in Palestine at the time of the birth and ministry of Jesus. A fourth chapter discusses the ministry of John, the forerunner of Jesus. Then the life of Jesus is taken up, but only in broad outline. As the author explains in his foreword there is no attempt "to include every item of the gospel records." The purpose is rather to discover the place and meaning of the personality and ministry of Jesus in the development of the kingdom of God. Some of the questions which it is proposed to try to answer are, "Under what conditions did Jesus begin His work? What purpose did He set before Him? How did He plan its achievement? What course did He pursue? What was the issue of His life? What manner of man was He?" etc.

The general plan followed in each study is to present first a clear and compact statement of the subject discussed. This covers from six to eight pages, and is followed by a page, more or less, of "directions" for the study of the chapter. These "directions" include a list of the Scripture passages to be read in connection, and notes of the special points to be studied or emphasized. If these directions are followed it is hard to see how these studies could fail to prove both interesting and profitable.

In taking up such a course of studies in the Scriptures at the present time, it always seems wise to inquire what attitude is taken towards the Bible as a divine revelation, and towards the person and work and especially the deity of Jesus, the Christ. The author answers this question in part when he says of his book, in the introduction, "It seeks to utilize assured critical results, but it does not give critical studies." And again, "Such a study will be historical; it must see Jesus in the movement of history and in the setting of His day. It must be vital, looking

beneath words and incidents to deeper meanings. It must be dynamic, not painting a mediaeval saint, beautiful but lifeless upon his background of gold, but showing us that Person from whom the potent forces of human history have come."

The studies begin with the baptism of Jesus so that there is no discussion of the Virgin birth. But the author's testimony is clear on the bodily resurrection. Speaking of the apparent discrepancies in the accounts of the resurrection given in the different gospels, he says: "In times past scholars tried to reconcile all these differences, believing that any error of any kind must make the whole Bible untrustworthy. We do not think so now. These records were composed a generation or more after the event. The writers have preserved for us the accounts current at the time of their writing. What we are concerned about is to know whether they agree in the central facts. And here there is no difference. The tomb is empty. The Lord appears to His disciples; to Peter, to the twelve, to the women. It is no mere vision, but a real appearance; Jesus speaks to them. And yet all agree that it is no return to the old life of physical intercourse."

The author also clearly recognizes the miraculous element in the casting out of evil spirits and the healing of bodily disease by Jesus. Referring to the healing of the demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum he says: "The cure of the demoniac was but the beginning of a great ministry of healing. Whatever the evil that came before Him, Jesus faced it with the same joyous conviction as to the power and mercy of God; He healed the lame and the blind just as He forgave men's sins. How did He do it? For many of these cases we have analogies in the power of suggestion as used even to-day. There are others that cannot be accounted for in any such way. Such explanations are interesting, but not necessarily final for Christian faith. If we believe that the God of mercy and power was present in Jesus Christ for the salvation of the world, then we shall not wonder at any such deed of power. Jesus Himself so regarded these healings as the deed of God. 'If I by the finger of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom of God come upon you,' Luke 11:20."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

The Peaceful Life. By Oscar Kuhns, Professor in Wesleyan University. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 234. Price \$1.00 net.

It is difficult to say which the reader finds most delightful in Prof. Kuhns' book, the renewing of an acquaintance with many happy and pertinent passages once enjoyed, or the revelation of the kindly and serene personality of the author. His text is a quotation from Dante, "Non divitiae, non voluptas, non honores, non longitudo vitae, non sanitas, non robur, non pulchritudo, sed pax," and he develops it by first analyzing the peaceful life and the hindrances thereto, and then by indicating the way to its attainment—through bodily and mental health, through the reading of great books, through an appreciation of nature, and finally, and most important of all, through an acceptance of the promises of religion and the cultivation of a religious spirit.

Especially at this time when the soul is torn by conflicting emotions and depressed by the turmoil of the world, is it good for us to be reminded that these things endure but for a session and that it is even now possible to rise above them in a spirit of faith.

Of interest to the preacher is Professor Kuhns' call for that sort of preaching upon which the Lutheran Church has insisted. Here, then is the great opportunity of the Church to-day; not to lessen its activity in social reform, philanthropy, and a higher civic ideal; but while active in these, at the same time to make new efforts to satisfy the yearning after God which lies deep down in the heart of multitudes of men and women all about us; to reveal and interpret in new terms that God who is all about us, and to show that even to-day He is nigh unto each one of us: 'Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.'

Professor Kuhns is the author of a life of John Huss, of translations from the Journal of Amiel, of "A One-sided Autobiography," a most interesting account of the reading of a life time, and of "German and Swiss Settlements in Colonial Pennsylvania."

E. S. L.

The Old Faith in the New Day. By Joseph M. M. Gray. Cloth. Pp. 258. Price \$1.00 net.

The author explains that "he has written in a downtown office amid the roar of a city's life, on trains, in still watches of the night, and during summer days beside the sea."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Church After the War. By William Oxley Thompson. Paper. Pp. 32. Price 25 cents net.

This is an address before the Ohio Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held in Columbus, in September 1917. Bishop Anderson contributes an Introduction to the printed copy in which he speaks of the author as thinking in continents and talking "with the reach and range of world-grasp and world-mastery." Dr. Thompson attributes the German war-spirit to rationalism, Prussianism, and national egotism. Its political philosophy makes might rather than right the basis of government. The Church must be ready and insistent with the message of truth and love. She must preach the love of God and the fact that He keeps His covenant. The Church must teach brotherhood and practice co-operation; and above all she must not despair, but in reliance upon her Lord, go forth and fulfil His last, great commission.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings with the assistance of John A. Selbie, M.A., D.D., and Louis H. Gray, M.A., Ph.D. Volume IX, Mundas—Phrygians. Cloth 8 x 11. Pp. xx. 911. Sold by Subscription only.

This great and learned work in its ninth volume of nearly a thousand pages is the product of the scholarship of nearly two-hundred specialists in the department of Religion and Ethics. It gives a new valuation to some of the distinguished characters of history such as Newman, Nietzsche, Pascal and Paul. Its articles on the more important subjects are really very thorough and comprehensive treatises. For instance, *Music* is discussed in fifty-six closely printed, double-column pages. *Mysticism* receives excellent treatment in thirty-five pages. The relation of mysticism to personal religious experience is so close and universal that it appeals to the attention of all students. The treatment of this and other subjects is, of course, historical rather than dogmatic. The reader must supply the deductions which are suggested. Nevertheless we find fearless criticism of errors. In the article on *Naturalism* the author shows wherein it is vulnerable because its conclusions lead one into absurd-

ity, and because it denies theology and ignores philosophy. *Nature* in its influence on life and literature is set forth in an interesting review of the teachings of twenty faiths and nations. One of the best articles is on *Negroes* in Africa and in the United States. Their importance, and status, intellectually, politically and economically in our own land are clearly indicated. Ancient heresies, whose influence was marked on philosophy and theology, are presented under *Neo-Platonism*, *Nestorianism* and the like. The article on *Neutrality*, though brief, sets forth very clearly international law on the status and rights of neutrals. As bearing on the present war we quote: "The ordinary State may be neutral and remain neutral or not as it pleases. But States like Belgium and Switzerland have not this freedom of choice. By international agreement they have bound themselves to refrain from engaging in war unless in strict self-defense, and, so long as they observe this agreement, the guaranteeing Powers undertake to protect them from attack. Thus the invasion of Belgium in 1914 by Germany, one of the guaranteeing Powers, was the immediate cause of the participation of Britain in the European War. The province of Savoy, the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, and the Suez Canal occupy a position similar to that of Switzerland. The persons of nurses, doctors and chaplains attending to the sick during the war have also by covenant acquired a neutral character." The article on *Nonconformity* will be read with much interest in the present struggle which involves the democratizing not only of States but of the Church. There can be no lasting peace until this be accomplished. *Old Age*, *Ordeal*, *Ordination* and *Original Sin* are discussed. The last article asserts that Genesis does not teach that the sin of Adam produced "any corruption or dislocation of human nature." "It does not represent that Adam's posterity was involved in the consequences of his sin." The doctrine of original sin as taught in theology, it is declared, is never hinted at in the Old Testament. It is acknowledged, of course, that St. Paul teaches original sin. Nevertheless "it is seen to have no basis in the Scripture save in an incidental analogy drawn by St. Paul, and it is known that he derived his conception of Adam and the Fall from free Jewish speculation. It is recognized that the doctrine of the unfallen state of man * * is equally unscriptural," and also untrue. Evolutionary anthropological science and generic psychology have clearly demonstrated, the au-

thor affirms, the error of the traditional beliefs as to sin and the Fall. The treatment of this subject by Dr. F. R. Tennant seems to us to be unsympathetic, unfair and unscientific.

The *Papacy* is characterized most strikingly as "a fragment of the Middle Ages surviving in a later generation; and this is its refutation. For life is a stream; and, in religion as elsewhere, a return to the past is impossible; the past is a stage in the process that has been definitely left behind. Those who urge that this applies not only to Catholicism but to Christianity may be met with Richard Rothe's summing up of Church History, 'Das Christentum ist das Allerveränderlichste, das ist sein besonderer Ruhm.' The Papacy has, Christianity has not, arrested and excluded change."

In the article on *Persecution* Roman Catholicism is bitterly scored for its cruelty and intolerance. The false boast of some Romanists that the Bible has always been an open and accessible book to the masses is abundantly contradicted by such facts as the declaration of Pius VII, in 1816, that Bible Societies were a "fiendish instrument for the undermining of the foundation of religion." The horrors of the Spanish Inquisition are also set forth. In regard to Luther it is said, "There was a momentary glimpse of this [view against persecution] by Luther at Worms, but he soon lost sight of it; and the familiar confessions of the Reformation admit the right of the civil authority to coerce in matters of religion" (p. 760). This sentence is positively untrue. Luther was opposed to religious persecution all his life. He was against the use of the sword as a weapon of religion. The only exception to this rule was he agreed that for the sake of peace expulsion of certain partisans from certain lands was proper. As to the "Confessions" the statement is equally untrue. Certainly the chief confession of all, that of Augsburg, has not a word on persecution. This, however, does not deny that persecution did not exist; but Luther and the confessions are not to blame.

On the whole the *Cyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* is a valuable storehouse of learning and we commend it to all students of the important subjects of which it treats.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Sermons on the Apostles' Creed. By Rev. Robert Emory Golladay, A.M., Pastor of Grace Lutheran Church,

Columbus, Ohio 12mo. Cloth binding. Pages X + 461. Price \$1.50 postpaid.

This is Volume II of Rev. Golladay's series of "Sermons on the Catechism." In the *QUARTERLY* for January 1916 we gave an extended review of the first volume of this series. That volume treated of the first Part of the Catechism, the Ten Commandments. This volume takes up the second Part, the Creed. As announced in Volume I the series contemplates two more volumes on the other two Parts of the Catechism, The Lord's Prayer, and The Sacraments.

We welcome this second volume, and might repeat of it practically all that was said in praise of the first volume. The discussion follows the same general plan, and the treatment is again full and very suggestive. There are two introductory sermons on "The Need of a Creed" and "The Apostles' Creed." Then follow ten sermons on the first Article of the Creed, fifteen on the second Article, and eleven on the third Article.

As would be expected, Rev. Golladay speaks in no faltering or uncertain tones on the various questions which are in controversy to-day between the conservative and the radical theologians, such as the doctrines of the Trinity, the Virgin birth, the bodily resurrection of Jesus, the atonement, etc. While he does not ignore the objections to these doctrines raised by the higher critics and the disciples of the so-called New Theology, he never for a moment yields to them a single atom of the truth which is embodied in the Apostles' Creed and which has been held sacred by the Church for so many centuries.

After reading a number of volumes from authors belonging to the modern rationalist school, or more or less under its influence, with their doubts, and hesitation, and quibbles, and carefully guarded and often most specious modifications of the truth, it is certainly refreshing to take up a book by an author who knows what he believes and does not hesitate to speak out with the clear and positive tones of assured conviction.

In illustration of this, and also as an example of the author's general style, we quote a paragraph or two from the sermon on "Jesus Christ the Son of God." "It is necessary not only to make the statement that we hold Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, but to explain what we mean by the statement. This necessity arises from the fact that many accept, and themselves use, the terms setting forth the Divinity of Jesus Christ, but put an inter-

pretation on them which annuls their real force. Calling Jesus Christ the Son of God, they explain, when pressed, that they mean that He is the Son of God only in the same sense in which we may be called the sons of God. Though most of these are willing to credit Jesus with a higher degree of those qualities which make Him a Son of God than can be attributed to any of us. It is not in this sense that we, the Apostles' Creed, the Bible, use the term 'Son of God' as applied to Jesus Christ.

"Our sonship is separated from the Sonship of Jesus Christ by an infinite distance. We are sons, He is the Son. We are sons by a new spiritual birth, He is the only begotten, the eternally begotten Son.

"When we speak of Jesus Christ as the Son of God we mean that He is God in the very same sense in which the eternal Father is God, 'very God of very God, of one substance with the Father.' We mean that every attribute, every quality which exists in the person of the eternal Father, exists also in Jesus Christ. And this without any alteration or diminution. 'I and my Father are one.'"

We again heartily commend this excellent series of sermons to all our pastors as of special value in preparation for the catechetical hour with the children and young people. We commend them also to the reading of our intelligent laymen. The thought is clear and the language simple. Both are easily within the comprehension of any reader of ordinary intelligence. But few technical theological terms are used, and when they are used, as they sometimes must be, they are explained so as not to be stumbling-blocks to those who are unfamiliar with them.

We believe also that many pastors would do well to follow the example of Mr. Golladay in preaching a series of sermons on the Catechism at their regular Sunday morning or evening services. If there is anything that our people need in these days when there are so many winds of false doctrine sweeping through the land, it is that they should be fully grounded in the great fundamental truths of our holy religion which are so well set forth and so strongly emphasized in Luther's Catechism.

We are pleased to note in the preface to this volume that the publication of Volume III, on the Lord's Prayer, is promised at an early date. We trust that the author may be able soon to complete the entire series.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. NEW YORK.

Understanding the Scriptures. By Francis J. McConnell, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. 12mo. Pp. 144. Cloth. Price 75 cents net.

This volume contains the third series of lectures delivered in De Pauw University on the Mendenhall Foundation. The general subject of the lectures on this foundation, as provided for by the donor, is "the evidences of the divine origin of Christianity, and the inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures."

The title of this series might well have been, "What the Bible is." There are six lectures, or chapters. The first one deals with some "Preliminary" matters having to do with the general subject of Biblical interpretation, and especially with the proper attitude of mind to be taken towards modern critical and historical methods of dealing with the Scriptures. Bishop McConnell is disposed to accept the general conclusions of the critical and historical school, but with some caution as to details. The following sentences seem to express his general attitude: "While, in general, the larger contentions of the biblical school are productive of good, yet, because of the part that assumption plays in the fashioning of all critical tools, the assumptions must be scrutinized with all possible care. A good practical rule is to read widely from the critics, to accept what they generally agree upon, to hold very loosely anything that seems 'striking' or 'brilliant.' This is a field in which originality must be discounted. There is so little check upon the imagination."

The other five lectures deal with the Bible as the Book of Life, The Book of Humanity, The Book of God, The Book of Christ, and The Book of the Cross. The last three chapters are tied together by this opening sentence of the last chapter: "If the central idea of the Scriptures is their idea of God, and if the climax of the biblical revelation is Christ, the greatest fact about Christ from the point of view of the Bible is his cross."

The discussion is always thoughtful and suggestive as we would expect Bishop McConnell to be. The sentence last quoted seems also to recognize pretty clearly the divine character and authority of the Scriptures as a revelation of God and from God, and to give Christ and His cross the central place which belongs to them. Yet we cannot help wishing that he might have been a little more clear and definite on these points, especially in a series of addresses to a group of university young men. In read-

ing we somehow get the impression that the writer was trying to say as little as possible, rather than as much as possible, for the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures. There is a lack of positive statements that somehow suggests a lack of positive and clear conviction back of the statements. This may be only the modesty of the investigator who is seeking the truth rather than announcing it. But we suspect that the object of the founder of this lectureship was to bring to the young men in the university a more positive teaching to act as an antidote to the doubts and questions that might be awakened by the critical spirit of the age, and which are all too prevalent in most of our schools of higher education.

It would seem as though the bishop felt something of this kind himself, for in the closing lecture he says: "This essay is quite as significant for what it has not said as for what it has said. In our omissions we have tried to keep clear the main outlines of scriptural revelation. We have sought to hold fast to principles rather than to discuss details. We have done this because we have believed that there is more value for religious understanding in pointing out the loftier biblical peaks which give the direction of the whole range than in tracing our pathways through detailed passages. Moreover, we have been afraid to employ many theoretical terms lest we blur the quick moral impressions made by the Scripture phrasing."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Every Church Its Own Evangelist. By Loren W. Edwards. 12mo. Cloth binding. Pp. 161. Price 50 cents net.

This is a very suggestive and stimulating little volume. It is written by a Methodist minister, and naturally the subject is treated from the Methodist point of view and in a way that is especially adapted to Methodist methods of work. The author assumes that each church and pastor will conduct an evangelistic campaign at least once a year. This might not be acceptable or even practicable in churches, like the Lutheran for example, which lay more stress on the educational method of building up the kingdom.

At the same time we believe that no earnest-minded and consecrated pastor in any Church could read this book without having his heart warmed and his zeal for

soul winning quickened. He would also find in it many valuable suggestions as to plans of work both for himself and for his people.

We may say what we will as to the comparative merits of the educational and the evangelistic methods of work, the simple truth is that we need them both. No matter how faithfully and earnestly the educational method may be applied, there will still be found in every community and in every congregation some whom it has not reached and whom it cannot reach. If these are to be won for Christ at all and saved it must be done by some kind of evangelistic effort. The only question seems to be whether this effort shall be made under the direction of the local pastor assisted by his own people, or whether some professional evangelist shall be called in from the outside to organize a whirlwind campaign that will probably disorganize the work of the local pastors and churches for a generation afterward. The only other alternative would be for the pastors and churches frankly to confess their impotence to reach a large proportion of the community, and supinely to consent to see them remain outside of the Church to live and to die unsaved.

We believe with Dr. Edwards that every pastor ought to be an evangelist, and that every church ought to be evangelistic. We need to conserve the children of the Church of course. Not one of them should be allowed to stray away from the fold, if it is at all possible to prevent it. For this purpose the educational method is undoubtedly the best when used faithfully and wisely. But we need also to seek the sheep that are lost. We need to go out into the highways and hedges and to compel men to come in to the marriage feast. For this kind of work some kind of evangelism is necessary. It need not be the "tabernacle" variety. It need not even follow Methodist lines. Each pastor must be his own judge as to what is the best method for him. But we believe that in some way he should be his own evangelist, and should try so to organize his people as to make them all his helpers in the work of soul winning.

Hence, we commend this volume to all who are desirous of meeting this need. They may not wish to adopt all of Dr. Edward's methods and plans, but they will find here a great wealth of suggestion that will help them to work out their own plans and methods and to make them efficient and successful.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. NEW YORK AND CINCINNATI.

A Prophet of the Spirit: A Sketch of the Character and Work of Jeremiah. By Lindsay B. Longacre, Professor of Old Testament Literature and Religion, Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colo. 12mo. Pp. 128. 75 cents.

Although Jeremiah is the prophet of the spiritual life and of individual religion and the most popular prophet with the Jews, he has not been the best-known of the prophets to readers of the English Bible. Interpretations such as this one, however, are doing much to bring "the weeping prophet" back to his place of supremacy. Both the prophet and his message have a special meaning for Lutherans, and a new appreciation of Jeremiah would be a worthy fruit of our quadricentennial celebration of the Reformation.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

THE GORHAM PRESS. BOSTON.

Jeptha's Daughter; A Drama in Five Acts. By James Monroe Cromer, D.D. 12mo. Cloth binding. Pp. 103.

The author of this attractive little volume is one of our own General Synod ministers. He was for many years in charge of the First Lutheran Church of Kansas City, Missouri, and is well known throughout the central west as a scholarly and effective preacher. So far as we know this is his first essay at authorship though he has been a frequent contributor to the weekly Church papers, and also to the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

Most Bible readers, we presume, will agree with Dr. Cromer when he says in his preface that "No portion of the Old Testament Scriptures has had more charms for the author than this little story in which Jeptha's daughter is the heroine." His avowed purpose in putting it into dramatic form is "to make it more real and impressive." He also suggests that it may be used for presentation on the stage. For this purpose ample directions are given for the entrance and exit of the characters and for their arrangement on the stage.

Of course some liberty is taken with the Bible narrative, but there is nothing that violates the principle of verisimilitude or strains the limits of propriety.

With the exception of a few lyric passages, which are intended to be sung by a chorus, it is written in blank verse and the work is well done. Many of the passages are truly dramatic and are filled with noble and beautiful sentiment most fitly expressed. We quote but one example of this, the words put into the mouth of Jephtha's daughter when she finally understands, from her father's deep grief and broken exclamations, that her life is to be forfeited as the price of victory over the enemies of her people in fulfillment of her father's rash and unhappy vow. She says:

"My father, dear, if thou hast spoken to
Thy God in solemn vow, do unto me
As thou didst pledge.

Our God hath done His part,
And made thee conqueror o'er all thy foes,
And set our country free. The Ammonites
Have fallen by thy sword, and if our God
Hath chosen me the price of victory,
His will be done.

I freely yield my life.
In such a death there is no bitterness.
Dear father, rise, be comforted. We have
But one life to live. Those live it best
Who give the most to God. He gave us all,
And soon, at best, we all must yield to death.
What matters whether few or more the days
We spend in weary pilgrimage? Our lives
Are measured, not by years, but by our deeds.
And if my life must be the price of peace
And happiness for Gilead, I count
It honor far beyond desert to yield."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

PUBLICATION AND S. S. BOARD OF THE REFORMED CHURCH
IN THE U. S. PHILADELPHIA, PA.

*Life and Letters of the Rev. John Philip Boehm, Founder
of the Reformed Church in Pennsylvania. 1683-1749.*
Edited by the Rev. William J. Hinke, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of Semitic Languages in Auburn Theological
Seminary. Cloth, 6 x 9. Pp.xxvi. 501.

This volume is a valuable contribution not only to the history of the Reformed Church but to the religious history of our country. Through the deep interest and

liberality of Dr. James I. Good the historical records of the (German) Reformed Church were made accessible to the author and translator, Dr. Hinke. Fortunately the correspondence of the Reformed Churches in Pennsylvania with the authorities of the Reformed Church in Holland has been carefully preserved at Amsterdam and the Hague. The attention of Dr. Good having been called to this fact, he visited the Hague in 1896 and discovered there many of the minutes of the American Coetus and other valuable matter. Dr. Hinke was sent abroad for several summers to copy various documents preserved in the Dutch Archives. The immediate result of these visits and labors was "upwards of four thousand pages of manuscript and one thousand photographs."

With the genius, art and industry of the true historian, Dr. Hinke has given his Church a true picture of John Philip Boehm, who, coming to America from Worms in 1720, became the founder, preserver, defender and historian of the (German) Reformed Church in Pennsylvania and America. His personal history is very interesting. His integrity, self-denial and sound judgment saved the Reformed Church in a critical period of its early history. He received too little credit during his life for the work which he accomplished; and it is only now through the present historian that he has at last received justice. The principal credit for the founding of the Reformed Church has been usually given to Michael Schlatter, a Swiss, who was sent to this country by the Synods of Holland in 1746, and who with Boehm and two other ministers and twenty-seven elders "met in the old meeting house in Philadelphia and organized the Coetus (Convention) of the Reformed Churches in Pennsylvania."

Boehm was by vocation a teacher and farmer, but at the earnest plea of the scattered Reformed settlers in the Perkiomen Valley he became their pastor without regular ordination. Two years later his right to the ministry being questioned by a German pastor, Weiss, who came with a company of Palatines in 1827, Boehm sought and received recognition and formal ordination by the authority of the Church in Holland. His ordination took place in the Dutch Reformed Church in New York, November 23, 1729. He was pledged to the acceptance of the Heidelberg Catechism and the Formulas of Unity of the Synod of Dort. The first Coetus in Philadelphia definitely accepted these symbols and thus declared its position "as a Calvinistic body."

These facts show the connection of the German Reformed Churches of Pennsylvania with the Dutch Reformed of Holland and of New York. The relations of the former with Holland continued until 1792.

Boehm died April 29, 1749, at Hellertown, Pa. As no Reformed minister could be secured to officiate at his funeral, a Mennonite preached the funeral sermon. "Having fought against the sects all his life, Boehm was buried by a sect preacher!"

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION HOUSE. PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The Reformation in Principle and Action; A Bird's Eye View of the Reformation. By Sanford N. Carpenter. Cloth. Pp. xi. 294.

This volume of ten chapters is composed of sermon-lectures delivered by Dr. Carpenter in Trinity Lutheran Church, of Johnstown, Pa., of which he is the honored pastor. These lectures cover the Reformation, not only in Germany, but in Switzerland, Scotland, England and France, with references also to the Netherlands and Spain. The diction of the volume is clear, simple, and graphic. The facts are selected and grouped to form an interesting narrative. The chief characters, like Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Knox and Queen Mary are given due prominence.

The volume is well worthy perusal, especially for those who have no access to larger historical works.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE GRIFFITH AND ROWLAND PRESS. PHILADELPHIA, PA.

American Poets and Their Theology. By Dr. Augustus Hopkins Strong, President Emeritus of the Rochester Theological Seminary. Cloth, 6 x 8½. Pp. xxiii. 485. Price \$1.00 plus postage.

This is a beautiful book at a nominal price. The contents match the appearance. Dr. Strong is a prolific author and a distinguished conservative theologian. Apart from his Calvinism and his Baptist construction of baptism we are in hearty sympathy with his general theological attitude. In the present volume he puts nine great American poets—Bryant, Emerson, Whittier, Poe, Longfellow, Lowell, Holmes, Lanier and Whitman—to

the test of orthodox faith. Of these Poe and Whitman were immoral men, who degraded their powers to ignoble ends. Emerson was a "non-ethical" monist and a "half-fledged" pantheist. Lowell, while "our chief poetical moralist," had no faith in miracles or special revelation. "He was a theist and not a Christian." The rest were earnest religious men, of whom Bryant and Lanier came nearest to a correct form of belief. All this indicates that theology is an exact science and that its truest expression is not to be sought in men of imagination who have had no technical training. Dr. Strong's book is enriched with numerous choice selections from the authors discussed.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

Army and Navy Service Book, for Public and Private Use. Prepared by the Common Service Book Committee of the Lutheran Church, 1917. Cloth, 3½ x 6. Pp. 107. Price 20 cents for single copies; \$1.50 per 100.

This neat, nicely bound little Service Book ought to be in the possession of every Lutheran soldier and sailor. The first seven pages contain brief orders of service; the next eleven Scripture readings. A dozen pages are devoted to prayers for special occasions and circumstances. The Orders for Holy Communion and for Burial are included. Sixty-two Church Hymns and three national airs—The Star Spangled Banner, Battle Hymn of the Republic, and The Red, White and Blue constitute the hymnal. One of the front fly-leaves provides blanks for the Name, Service, and Home Address of the soldier, and also for the Pastor's Name and Address.

Let every Lutheran congregation and pastor see to it that their men in the national service are provided with the *Service Book*.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Lutheran Church Year Book for 1918. Issued under the auspices of the General Synod, the General Council, the United Synod in the South, and the Joint Synod of Ohio. Paper. Sixe 6 x 8½. Pp. 266. Price 25 cents postpaid; \$5.00 for 50.

This Year Book and Almanac should be commended by the pastors and circulated by tens of thousands. It is a

valuable store-house of Lutheran facts. Beside the usual Almanac for the civil and the church year, occupying 33 pages, it contains 38 pages of devotional, doctrinal and historical reading matter, followed by 180 pages of statistics and the clerical register. Here one will find the name and address of every Lutheran minister in the United States and Canada, of every Lutheran institution, society and periodical. He will find information concerning every Synod with the time of meeting, and with the names of its officers. The statistics of the Lutheran Church are given in various tables showing its distribution by States and Territories, and by nations, and its growth in America for three centuries. In 1638 there were only 50 Lutherans in America, in 1738 there were only 5,000, in 1798 about 20,000, in 1900 over 1,665,000, and in 1917 nearly 2,500,000 confirmed members.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS. CAMBRIDGE.

Ephod and Ark. A Study in the Records and Religion of the Ancient Hebrews. By William R. Arnold. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ x 6 in. Pp. 170. Price \$1.50 net.

This is the third volume of the Harvard Theological Studies, so attractively issued by the Harvard University Press. Dr. Arnold has here given a brilliant treatment of two vexing problems of Hebrew archaeology. What was the Ephod? and, What was the Ark? The Ephod was (1) an "apron" or "loin-cloth" worn by laymen as well as priests when engaged in solemn religious exercises." (I S. 2:18, 6:14). (2) It was "a ceremonial vestment worn by the high priest over his tunic and robe." (Ex. 29:5; Lev. 8:7). (3) "A solid body, carried not worn, and only by priests. . . . as the specified object of divination." (I Sam. 21:10; 23:9; 30:7; Judges 8:23-27).

The Ark is one of the Hebrew institutions which has not been consigned to the limbo of imaginary institutions, like the Tabernacle, by the most radical of critics. What was it and what was its significance in Israel? The word (אֲרֹן) is originally and simply a "box"—it is used, e. g., for "coffin" (Gen. 50:26) and for "chest" II Kings 12:9, 10). Then, (2) it was the sacred chest containing the tables of the *Torah* (Ex. 37; Deut. 10)—though Professor Arnold does not allow the historicity of these passages. His thesis is that "when Epod stands

for a solid object, it has been substituted by Jewish scribes for a more troublesome word"—and that more troublesome word is "Ark." Professor Arnold finds his clue in I Sam. 14:18, where M reads "Ark" but G reads "Ephod," though he admits that the Hebrew text shows signs of corruption. Professor Arnold's reconstructed text reads: "And Saul said to Ahijah, bring hither the sacred ark; for he carried the sacred ark before that day." The ארון האלהים here used is equated with ארון אלהים as an indeterminate appellative and is to be explained by the fact that there were many such sacred boxes in Israel: "The historical ark of Yahweh was not a unique but a manifold object attached to every Palestinian sanctuary that possessed a consecrated priesthood." This position Professor Arnold defends most ably. Its acceptance solves, as he claims, the vexing problem of the Ephods; but it is at the price of the boldest kind of textual reconstruction and all Hebrew tradition. It is a case of "Athanasius contra mundum" among radical critics. Prof. Arnold hardly expected a spontaneous acceptance of his thesis, and in this he has not been disappointed. We await the verdict of his fellow-critics with interest.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

The Luther Coat of Arms, on stiff card-board, beautifully illuminated in appropriate colors, together with the explanation in old English lettering.

The work is that of an artist. When suitably framed it is worthy of a place on the wall of the pastor's study, of the home, and of the Sunday-School.

It is offered in two sizes, 10 x 18 and 5 x 8. Price \$1.00 for the larger, and 25 cents for the smaller. Address Mr. Max B. Gerste, 35 West 39th St., New York.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Slumber-Land and Slumber-Songs. A Collection of Lullabies and Bedtime Poems. By the Rev. P. C. Croll, D.D. Beardstown, Ill. Paper, 6 x 8½ Pp. 68. Price 25 cents.

This compilation of lullabies includes selections from many authors, including Luther, Tennyson, Holland, Gilder, Van Dyke, Eugene Field, Ella W. Wilcox, and Margaret Sangster. They are all pure and beautiful and should find a ready welcome from every mother.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

GERMAN LITERARY BOARD. BURLINGTON, IOWA.

A System of Natural Theism. By Leander S. Keyser, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio. Cloth. Pp. 144. Price \$1.00.

Dr. Keyser is a prolific author and valiant defender of the faith. The present treatise is one of his best productions. It is the outgrowth of his lectures in the Hamma Divinity School and Wittenberg College in which he is professor of Theism, Ethics and Christian Evidences.

Based upon the larger works of Valentine, Harris, Micou, Flint, Fisher, Browne and others, it is nevertheless original in its arrangement and statement, and offers to the student a simple but comprehensive view of the rational arguments for the Divine Existence.

The author takes the usual ground that "perhaps no purely rational process can give the human mind absolute assurance of the existence of God, especially the mind that has once been caught in the meshes of atheism. That assurance doubtless can be obtained only through a clear-cut Christian experience." As a matter of fact the theistic arguments were formulated to confirm faith rather than to create it. Nevertheless, the arguments in their cumulative power are to my mind unanswerable, and should appeal to those who are open to conviction. At all events they present insurmountable barriers to false philosophy.

The treatise before us is divided into four parts: Introduction, Proofs of Divine Existence, Anti-Theistic Theories, and Divine Attributes and Relations. The emphasis naturally falls on the second part, in which are discussed the philosophical, moral and esthetic proofs.

The Ontological Argument as formulated by Anselm had an able vindication at the hands of the late Prof. Micou (Basic Ideas in Religion). Anselm rightly insisted that the idea of God was *sui generis*, not a mere thought of the understanding, but the direct intuition of divine reality. Anselm's postulate is that God exists so truly that He cannot be thought not to exist. Only the fool has said in his heart, "There is no God."

The following syllogism, as I have formulated it for my classes, seems to me quite conclusive. 1. There is a universal intuitive conviction that there is an absolute Being. 2. This universal intuition must have an objective counterpart. 3. Hence an absolute Being exists.

Dr. Keyser's volume is heartily commended as a brief, clear and forcible presentation of Natural Theism.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

GENERAL COUNCIL PUBLICATION HOUSE. PHILA., PA.

Luther's Hymns. By Rev. J. F. Lambert, Pastor of St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Catasauqua, Pa. Cloth. Pp. xviii. 160. Price \$1.35.

There is no phase of Luther's life and work which is not interesting. In his hymns there is valuable material for historian, biographer, theologian and musician, and this material Mr. Lambert presents in such fashion that not only may the scholar find information in his book, but also that the layman may be edified.

Luther's Hymns begins well in that it gives to the reader an historical background in a sketch of pre-Lutheran hymnody in Old Testament days and in the ancient church, and also an account of the way in which Luther's experience prepared him for his work as a hymn writer. Following is a well-selected series of tributes to Luther, especially to Luther the musician, and an account of the initial publication of the hymns.

Each hymn is then printed in full with the tune and an English translation and also as full a history of the hymn as may be gathered. These sketches are not limited to a description of the origin of words and music, but include various incidents, many of them romantic and thrilling, connected with occasions upon which the hymns have been sung, in war and peace, by the solitary sufferer, or in times of national calamity or rejoicing.

It would seem that no Lutheran pastor should allow this centennial year to pass without instructing his congregation in the value of this heritage which is theirs. Surely none can now plead that the material for such instruction is lacking since Mr. Lambert has presented it in such convenient and interesting form.

E. S. L.

AUGUSTIANA BOOK CONCERN. ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

Little Playmates, Sayings and Doings of Other Children, with 32 Illustrations. Paper. Pp. 32. Size 7 1/2 x 9 1/2. Price 20 cents; per doz. \$1.92 net.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY is a religious magazine owned and controlled by its editors. It is not, however, to be regarded as their personal organ, neither is it published for private profit but solely in the interests of the Church. It is always open to contributors regardless of denominational affiliation, but its chief purpose is to be the medium for the discussion of theological, religious, historical and social questions from the view-point of the Lutheran Church, especially that portion of it known as the General Synod.

The editors of the QUARTERLY stand firmly and uncompromisingly for the orthodox faith as confessed by the Lutheran Church, and never knowingly publish any article which attacks or discredits the fundamental doctrines or principles of the Christian religion. Within these limits they regard the QUARTERLY as a forum for courteous and scholarly discussion. Without such liberty the truth in its many phases can not be developed.

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors who are amenable to the discipline of the Church alone. Neither does the publication of an article mean that they endorse all the views which it presents. Should any of the contributors fall into serious error, or present false and dangerous views, they may and usually will be corrected in subsequent issues by the editors, or by others.

The editors believe that on this basis the QUARTERLY will commend itself to its readers and to all intelligent and thoughtful Lutheran ministers and laymen who are cordially invited to become subscribers.

BASED ON ORIGINAL SOURCES

Luther's Correspondence and Other Contemporary Letters

Translated and Edited by Preserved Smith, Ph. D.

What a wonderful privilege it is to read the private letters of Martin Luther and the active men of Reformation days. These faithful reflections of their innermost lives show their secret feelings, loves, hates, hopes, suspicions, confidences and comments. There is hardly a better way to obtain a clear insight into the causes and effects of the Reformation—it is history at first-hand.

It is also intensely human and with biographical notes and other necessary annotations, sheds much light on this period of Luther's early spiritual struggle, 1507-1521, the time covered by Volume I. Two more volumes are in preparation.

What Non-Lutherans Have Said About It

"It was a happy thought that suggested the publishing of these letters and the great usefulness of the book is evident and will be appreciated by all those who wish to find the inner sources of the Reformation."—Boston Transcript.

"Such books as this should be in the library of every minister and layman interested in the Reformation period."—Reformed Messenger.

"We doubt if there is another American scholar so well fitted to perform the task as Dr. Smith."—The Advance.

"A treasure-house of the sixteenth century originals more than usually accessible and of great value."—English Historical Review, London.

"This is a valuable source-book of the history of the great revolutionary movement of which Luther was the protagonist."—The Outlook.

Isn't it just the book your library needs—just the information and inspiration you need?

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY

1424 ARCH STREET

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

